

July 11, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14387

elastic work crew for concentrated effort to make this ancient dream come true.

The developments I have recited demonstrate that the Center has become the focus of a worldwide ever accelerating cooperative effort to make law the major factor in world affairs. We have largely done our research and planning and now we are into the law development phase of our program. We are concentrating on converting the idea of a world rule of law into processes, procedures and institutions.

I and thousands of law leaders the world over agree with the statement of Chief Justice Warren to the Washington World Conference last September:

"... Achieving and maintaining a rule of law strong enough to regulate actions of nations and individuals in the world community is no more dreamy, impossible or impracticable than was the dream of splitting the atom, or putting a man on the moon or sending a missile to Mars a few years ago. I believe we of our generation can translate the centuries-old dream of a world ruled by law from dream into reality.

"In part, my belief is based upon the imperatives of our day which make this a necessity to save mankind from nuclear holocaust. In part, my belief is based upon the fact that there are more law and judicial institutions today, nationally and internationally, than ever before in the history of mankind."

We cannot expect to replace force with nothing and leave a vacuum. The only way force can be replaced is with something to take its place. And the lesson of history is that the only proven replacement for force as a controller of the lives and actions of men and nations is the rule of law. When law is strong enough to be a credible replacement for force, world peace through law can then be a reality.

Let me remind that in this program we are not urging world government or Utopia. Under the rule of law men will always have conflicts and disputes. And nations are run by men. A law system will do no more than provide law rules to prevent conflict and channel the inevitable disputes into court-houses for peaceful decision as a substitute for decision by violence on battlefields.

We lawyers live by settling or avoiding disputes. We are experts on this. We have now lifted our sights, our thinking and our abilities to the toughest problem of them all: the ending of decision by death. In civilized nations we have largely done this but the law of the jungle prevails among nations. Thus we have set for law the most ambitious goal in all history by bringing law to bear on the problem of world peace. We are working successfully on the practical mechanics of this goal by expanding law in the world community. The only way to get change is to work for it and that we are doing. We are combining inventiveness, ingenuity and imagination with plain hard work. And frankly we are making progress. "Slow progress inch by inch" as Ambassador Goldberg said recently of a world ruled by law. But progress we are indeed making. The day of a functioning world order under law is coming closer due to our efforts.

The reverberations of the information explosion on law worldwide through the computer will be tremendous. The law materials previously available to a few will now be available to all. The impact of this availability on law, lawyers, judges and the people will be enormous. Law like muscles grows stronger with use. Law for all will indeed be more and more possible. Law will be used as an instrument to bring the wonders of modern living to all peoples in all nations and especially will law be available for use to create a peace structure for the world community.

When the rule of law prevails worldwide it will indeed have achieved its highest purpose and function as an instrument benefiting all

peoples. Then and then only will any man be able to travel any place on the face of the earth—and into the vistas of endless space—in freedom, in dignity and in peace.

CULVER URGES SUPPORT OF ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the elections for a constituent assembly in South Vietnam which have been scheduled for this coming September are crucial not only to the political stability of that country but to the successful conclusion of the military confrontation as well.

We cannot expect these elections to resolve all of the Government positions on the military, economic, and social problems of the nation. But they will be extremely valuable in forcing a national consensus from which the further policies of the Vietnamese Government can emerge.

It is absolutely essential, however, that these elections be carried out with the most scrupulous supervision to guarantee that no question can be raised as to the results. And it is equally critical that the decisions be accepted and abided by—not only by the Vietnamese but by the rest of the world as well.

It is for this reason that I am introducing a resolution today calling for supervision of the elections by an appropriate and impartial agency, such as the United Nations, and assuring that the United States will honor the election and the aspirations of the people of Vietnam as expressed by their freely chosen Government.

I ask that the text of my resolution be included at this point in the Record, and urge immediate action by the House of Representatives on this vital matter:

H. CON. RES. 820

Whereas the Republic of South Vietnam is actively engaged in making preparations for elections to choose a constituent assembly in a constructive effort to bring about a more representative government; and

Whereas the United States is dedicated to the principle, in the conduct of its foreign affairs, that people everywhere have the right to determine their own destinies through free participation in elected government; and

Whereas the success of the promised elections in South Vietnam will depend on the assurance that they will be free, fair, and open; and

Whereas an objective and international presence would make a significant contribution to assuring that the promised elections in South Vietnam are free, fair, and open, and thus help substantially in bringing about political stability and the establishment of effective political institutions: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress, the duly and freely elected representatives of the people of the United States of America, that it welcomes the holding of elections in the territory of South Vietnam; that it urges every effort to assure that said elections will determine the full and freely expressed wishes of the people; that it suggests the wisdom of having an appropriate and impartial international agency, such as the United Nations, to su-

pervise the election and to assure the widest acceptance of its results; and that the people of the United States of America through the leadership of the President, with the full support of the Congress, will fully honor the election and the aspirations of the people of South Vietnam as expressed by their freely chosen Government.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 60 minutes, on July 20; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include therein extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. YOUNGER in three instances.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KREBS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CALLAN in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. SLACK in two instances.

Mr. FARSTEIN in three instances.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. JOELSON in two instances.

Mr. BOLAND in three instances.

Mr. REES.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3423. An act to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3510. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a Connecticut River National Recreation Area, in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 13417. An act to amend the act of October 4, 1961, to facilitate the efficient preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14312. An act to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work

in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 30, 1966:

H.R. 13125. An act to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

On July 6, 1966:

H.R. 13650. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13652. An act to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government; and

H.R. 14182. An act to provide for judgments for costs against the United States.

On July 7, 1966:

H.R. 1535. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;

H.R. 2035. An act to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in star route contract prices;

H.R. 6125. An act to amend Public Law 722 of the 79th Congress and Public Law 85-935, relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution;

H.R. 7423. An act to permit certain transfers of Post Office Department appropriations;

H.R. 12322. An act to enable cotton growers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research and promotion to improve the competitive position of, and to expand markets for, cotton;

H.R. 13417. An act to amend the act of October 4, 1961, to facilitate the efficient preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes;

H.R. 14050. An act to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; and

H.R. 14312. An act to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 12, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2528. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of management of donated food programs for Mexico under title III, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2529. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 2, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations,

on an interim hurricane survey of northwest Florida coast, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 459); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

2530. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements signed during June 1936, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 55-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2531. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to simplify laws relating to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2532. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the 10th report of the Attorney General on competition in the synthetic rubber industry, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Report No. 117, 84th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2533. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the first annual report of the Office of Economic Opportunity for the preceding fiscal year, pursuant to the provisions of section 608 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2534. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the annual report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2535. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a report of the ratification of the amendment to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 (Public Law 81-845) by 11 of the 13 parties to the convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2536. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting a report on foreign students in the United States, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-256; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2537. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report of backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of May 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82-554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2538. A letter from the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions and the District of Columbia, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-352; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2539. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for effective guidance of Navajo Tribe of Indians in management of tribal funds, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2540. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of violation of statutes by use of management and investigations of resources funds for general administrative expenses, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2541. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for further improvement in accounting and financial reporting system, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2542. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

2543. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

2544. A letter from the Executive Director, the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, transmitting the audit of the association's accounts for the year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2545. A letter from LeBoeuf, Lamb & Leiby, Washington, D.C., transmitting a report titled "National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements—Report on Examination of Accounts at December 31, 1965," pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-376; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2546. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act of September 11, 1957, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2547. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the 13th report of the Department of State on its activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, for the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 81-152; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2548. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2549. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2550. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2551. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a request for the withdrawal and return of a certain case involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2552. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a request for the withdrawal and return of a certain case involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and National-

14402

tice its dismay over the overthrow of Argentina's constitutional regime.

The continued suspension of diplomatic and economic ties, they contended, would discourage other military uprisings and prevent the Argentine junta from becoming a dictatorship.

The Senators expressed concern about the developments after President Onganía indicated Saturday that he had no plan to call for elections or to lift the ban on political parties.

At the same time reports from Buenos Aires quoted diplomatic officials as confident that the United States would soon resume diplomatic relations which Washington suspended June 28.

VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently Mr. Stuart Chase wrote a very perceptive letter to the editor of the Washington Post, which appeared in the issue of June 24, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

VIETNAM BALANCE SHEET

The war in Vietnam has been escalating for almost a year and a half now, long enough to produce some accredited facts and much debate. Communiques from the front, reports by impartial journalists, editorials at home, teach-ins, full page advertisements, statements by the Pope, U Thant, de Gaulle and other world leaders, and most recently the Fulbright hearings—these are sufficient, I believe, to warrant a balance sheet. What do we stand to gain from this war, and what do we stand to lose?

The gains:

Our Government has carried on a policy inaugurated by former Administrations, and can thus claim a certain consistency in maintaining national policy and interest. (The fact that the national interest and honor have acquired a new and different complexion in the nuclear age is disregarded in evaluating this asset.) Vietnam provides a laboratory for testing new varieties of military hardware, chemicals and tactics. (Not all Americans, however, consider this a gain.) The rate of unemployment has been somewhat reduced by war spending.

The losses:

The detente with Russia, which promised so much for disarmament and ultimate world peace, has been disastrously weakened. To my mind this is the most serious loss of all, both for our country and for mankind. Vietnam, with the firepower now deployed or anticipated, will be battered to a pulp—its people, villages, rice fields. This is the major human cost. The American dead and wounded are also a grievous human cost. We are losing, if we have not already lost, the support of our allies around the world. Some governments may give uneasy assent, but not their people, if foreign reports are to be trusted. The Pope is critical and alarmed.

The United Nations has been materially weakened. U Thant is critical and alarmed.

Communist countries have been presented with a new arsenal of propaganda weapons, revolving around the charge of "imperialist aggression." Vietnam has seriously divided U.S. opinion, hurt President Johnson's consensus, and lined up many intellectuals and large church groups against the Administration. Most wars unify the home front; this war has sundered it. The credibility of official statements about the war is widely questioned. Many if not most citizens are confused and uneasy. Who is the enemy?

Head counts of Vietcong dead do not seem to quiet the uneasiness. There is danger, in the steady march of escalation, that Russia and China may forget their ideological differences. If so, World War III looms.

A final loss, hard to measure, is the sheer momentum of war. Powerful people, in and out of the Pentagon, are now so fiercely concentrated on military victory ("there is no substitute for victory") that one wonders if the process can be stopped. De Gaulle, to his credit, stopped the war in Algeria, but it takes great leadership, once the tanks begin to roll. How long will it be before this war goes out of all human control?

It does not take a CPA to certify that the liabilities exceed the assets on this balance sheet, and that the deficit is mounting.

STUART CHASE.

GEORGETOWN, CONN.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter by one of my valued constituents, Mr. Lee McEwen, to the editor of the distinguished newspaper in my State, the Texarkana Gazette, of May 27, 1966.

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

[From the Texarkana Gazette, May 27, 1966]

EDITOR'S MAILBOX

EDITOR, TEXARKANA GAZETTE:

I take exceptions to Thurman Sensing's article in the May 15th, 1966 Sunday Gazette captioned "The Ugly Senator," because of Sensing's unfounded and unfair implications as to Senator Fulbright's views on foreign affairs, alleged Fulbright quotes taken out of context and the general structure of the article being based upon much innuendo. From newspaper accounts and having watched on TV much of the Senate Foreign Relations committee hearings about the Viet Nam situation, I had the feeling that it was conducted in such a manner as to find our real purpose and to give the American people answers to questions that we are entitled to know.

Senator Fulbright has frankly admitted he could have been and was perhaps wrong in the past in supporting some of the various phases of our role in Southeast Asia. This is not the mark of a man that would have his every opinion taken verbatim without review. I get the impression that Senator Fulbright tempers his statements with a "let's examine and see before we act" attitude rather than that of making rash statements in concrete form.

He has stated in the course of the hearings that indeed, since we have committed ourselves in Viet Nam, we have a "face saving" responsibility as a great nation with great power and we hope great respect in all the world. The Senator has never advocated that we tuck our tails and run, only that we examine the possibilities of an honorable settlement or withdrawal from an extremely unstable situation in a country in which we are not even sure that the majority of the people want our assistance.

I think it unfair for Mr. Sensing to accuse the senator of being bent on "convincing the American people that they are 'ugly ducklings.'" The senator is not responsible for the number of unpleasant facts these hearings have laid bare to the public. The fact that we have used our influence to prevent elections in Viet Nam that were supposed to have been held long ago, is not the senator's sole responsibility.

It is a fact that these people in that area have been constantly engaged in warfare for the past 25 years and this is not the senator's fault. Do they think like we do? Do they want a system of government like ours? And in fact, do the majority want peace?

These are questions we should have answered.

Is it a proven fact that many millions of dollars that was intended to help the masses of South Viet Nam people has in fact made rich people out of a few profiteers over there? Who is to blame for this? We furnished the aid and should be responsible for its intended distribution.

Is it being an "Ugly Senator" to head a senate committee that seeks to find answers as to why we are expending American lives, and tax money, (the latter the least important) in a country where there is no clear cut leadership and where one after another regime has fallen? Are we not a people capable of knowing these answers? If in fact we have erred to any degree in our policy in Viet Nam, are we not big enough to make corrections?

Certainly, any good American will fight to hell and back in the cause of freedom. And I sincerely hope our role in Viet Nam will serve this purpose. However, I find it comforting to know that we have in our nation such men of influence and leadership as Senator FULBRIGHT, who have the courage he has shown in attempting to reveal important facts to the people which they are entitled to know about such actions.

Our system of government is such that we have always had "checks and balances" in the form of various leaders in moments of national crisis down through our history. Let us pray that this will always be so and that it will insure sufficient tolerance and patience where and when needed.

Criticize if you will, such dedicated men as FULBRIGHT if they have different views, but don't condemn them as demagogues. Had it not been for such men, our Republic would have never been founded. Certainly our Declaration of Independence was prompted by voices that dared speak out against the leadership of the time and against the financial interests of many of the citizens.

Speaking as one American, I found the public hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee informative and enlightening. It has given me cause to wonder if our interpretation of "freedom" can be effectively applied in Viet Nam.

The leaders in power, when we committed ourselves, are shot and dead now—there have been a number of different assumed leaders since. We have never known the true desire of the people. Recent demonstrations and other developments have indicated we have good cause to wonder if our help or presence is wanted.

In fact, we are involved in a civil war in another country whether we want to admit it or not. And it may well become a civil war within a civil war.

If the majority of those people choose to have a communist type government, can we legally and in good faith impose our will by force to prevent it. Though we may detest the system and the evil it breeds, we cannot, without being hypocritical, put a common brand on everyone and everything communist. If this is so, why are we aiding Yugoslavia?

It is right that the American people be alerted to potential hazards involved by our action so close to the Chinese mainland. It is careless to assume that China won't become directly involved.

Any nation of people that will spend 1500 years to build a defense wall to keep out invaders (1500 mile great wall of China began around 228-210 B.C.—completed the latter half of the 14th century) is by tradition and heritage bound to have a common fear of having their border exposed to foreigners. Whether they be ruled by clans of war lords or under the common direction of a Communist dictator, fear can cause a person or a nation to commit a suicidal act. I don't believe for a minute our leaders intend to

July 11, 1966

Mr. McNamara said it was expected that annual savings would increase to \$6.1 billion for 1969 and each year thereafter.

This cost-cutting program, Mr. McNamara said in his annual progress report to the President, has not only produced "very substantial savings" but has also improved the efficiency of the nation's military logistics system.

NOTES MILITARY BUILD-UP

The \$4.5 billion savings in 1966, the Secretary said, were achieved "at the same time we were building up a military force of about 350,000 men in Southeast Asia, some 10,000 miles from our shores" and were providing them weapons, ammunition and huge quantities of other needed combat supplies.

Mr. McNamara advised the President that the United States military effort in Southeast Asia had been increased in the last 12 months by 240 per cent in the number of military personnel deployed and 480 percent in the number of combat maneuver battalions.

He said that other increases had amounted to 235 per cent in the number of helicopters, 110 per cent in the number of land-based attack aircraft, 70 per cent in the number of naval vessels in offshore waters, 145 per cent in air ordnance expended, 310 per cent in the capacity of the ports, 240 per cent in the volume of dry cargo delivered by ship and 170 per cent in tonnage delivered by aircraft.

Further, he said, during the 1966 fiscal year the United States expanded production of fixed wing aircraft by 15 per cent, of helicopters by 60 per cent, of aluminum air field matting by 2,100 per cent, of air-delivered munitions by 1,300 per cent, of ground-delivered munitions by 160 per cent and of tropical uniforms by 6,700 per cent.

All this, Mr. McNamara noted, was accomplished without imposing wartime controls on wages, prices, or on civilian production and consumption.

The Secretary stressed that the Reserves had not been mobilized. And he said the Defense Department had held defense expenditures at a level lower than that of four of the past five years.

The level of spending was based on a percentage of the gross national product, which is the dollar measure of the nation's output of goods and services in a year.

Defense Department sources said that the spending percentage between 1961 and 1965 had been 8.5, 8.6, 8.4, 8.3, and 7.1. As far as can be estimated for the fiscal year 1966, they said, the figure was 7.6.

Mr. McNamara conceded that the Defense Department's "Primary" responsibility was to be ready for combat rather than to cut costs. However he said that without an "incentive" toward the economy the pervasive tendency in the Pentagon would be to overstate requirements, hoard stocks and manpower and "pyramid" supplies at each echelon of management.

The United States emerged from the Korean War with \$12-billion worth of surplus stocks, Mr. McNamara said.

"The over-funding during the Korean War was startling," he said, adding:

"In June, 1953, the Defense Department reported a total of \$12.7 billion programmed for air force spare parts for fiscal years 1951-54 compared with actual and projected consumption in those years of only 1.7-billion; and an inventory requirement of only \$1.5-billion.

"This is the kind of pitfall we are seeking to avoid in the current military build-up."

Under the present cost reduction program, Mr. McNamara said, the Defense Department stocks only enough to meet "normal peacetime needs plus the amount required to tide us over in wartime until production can catch up with consumption."

Even with hindsight, the Secretary asserted, "We could not have significantly improved" on the over-all performance of the

cost reduction program during the last five years.

Some mistakes were made, he conceded, and "there is room for improvement in the mechanics of the program" as was pointed out by Touche, Ross, Bailey & Smart, an independent public accounting concern hired by the Pentagon to review the program.

Citing the opinion of military commanders whom he did not identify, Mr. McNamara said:

"No military force in this century has been moved so far so fast, has been as well supplied and has sought as effectively as the force of 350,000 men, 1,800 fixed wing aircraft, and 1,700 helicopters which we currently have deployed in Southeast Asia."

"This has been achieved after realizing, during the past five years, \$14-billion in savings from the cost reduction program and after eliminating, during the same period, almost \$60-billion from the budget requests of the military services."

The cost reduction program is built on three basic principles, the Secretary said. These involve buying only what we need to achieve combat readiness, buying at the lowest sound price, and reducing operating costs by ending unnecessary operations, by standardization and by consolidation.

During the last year, Mr. McNamara said the Defense Department saved \$1.6 billion by refining calculations of requirements, by increasing the use of excess inventories, by eliminating costly items and by cutting inventories.

For example, he said, the number of items in the Pentagon inventory, which rose from 3.3 million in 1958 to 4 million in 1962, has been cut to 3.8-million at a major savings. It is estimated that each item costs \$100 to handle each year, he said.

The Secretary said that a deliberate shift from noncompetitive to competitive procurement had also helped to save about \$1.3-billion in the last year.

CREDIT UNION COOPERATIVES IN ARGENTINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an interesting article appears in the New York Times this morning. It describes the taking of control of the credit union cooperatives in Argentina by the Central Bank.

The article says this is the first dividend paid by the new military junta to its big business backers. If I understand the story correctly it is also a major blow to the development of a middle class in Argentina and eventually a democratic system. In view of this development I hope our Government will go very slowly in extending financial assistance to this new dictatorship.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record at this point.

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

BACKERS OF ONGANIA JUNTA PROFIT FROM CURB ON ARGENTINA'S CREDIT UNIONS (By H. J. Maidenberg)

BUENOS AIRES, July 10.—The business backers of Argentina's new military regime received their first dividend Friday when the Central Bank took control of the widespread credit-union cooperatives.

Banking interests had been particularly opposed to the growing competition of the credit cooperatives and had long urged their liquidation. Other business sectors have been equally outspoken against marketing

and other cooperative groups financed by these funds.

If the credit unions are dissolved as many believe they will be, the impact on Argentina's small-business men and consumers will be tremendous. Not only do the credit unions finance the corner grocer; they provide low-cost loans without collateral to tens of thousands of individuals.

Unable or unwilling to make small loans of this kind, commercial banks have seen these funds expand rapidly, particularly during the 32-month government of President Arturo U. Illia, which was overthrown June 28.

Although comparative figures are not available, a glance at the balance sheet of one of the typical unions of the 583 credit unions in the greater Buenos Aires district illustrates their recent growth.

The Villa Safores Credit Cooperative had 750 members in 1962. By last June 30 the membership had grown to 2,667. The Villa Safores Credit Cooperative's loans rose from the equivalent of \$72,000 for all of 1962 to \$900,000 in the first half of this year.

News of President Juan Carlos Ongania's decree placing the credit co-ops under Central Bank control and direction has thus far been overshadowed by the sesquicentennial events yesterday marking Argentina's independence. The full impact is expected to be felt this week.

However, the new Government's intentions were foreseen. A few days after the coup, overzealous Government aides ordered the arrest of 18 top officials of the Institute of Credit Cooperatives, which was formed in 1958 to act as spokesman for the autonomous units. President Ongania ordered the officials' release last Tuesday.

The credit unions were formed about 75 years ago by Jewish farmers and cattlemen in northern provinces. When the bulk of later Jewish immigration settled in the cities, the credit unions provided financing for small merchants and manufacturers that was usually not available to them.

Some foreign bankers conceded that these funds made possible the relatively high standards of living in Buenos Aires.

During the early decades of the credit unions they were often subject to harassment and despite the growing number of non-Jews in them they were the target of any anti-Semitic groups.

The broadening of the membership began during the 11-year rule of the former dictator, Juan D. Peron, whose strange economic theories hurt many in the banking community.

The greatest impetus occurred when President Illia's Government took office on October 11, 1963. His efforts to curb inflation pinched the banks.

Officially, the new Government has taken the position that the Central Bank, which is similar to the Federal Reserve System in the United States, could not regulate the nation's monetary policy with about a fifth of the country's banking business outside its control.

Officials of the Institute of Credit Cooperatives contend that they are already subject to banking regulations.

The first test of the Government's order is expected Tuesday when several credit unions plan to hold mass rallies. If held, they will be the first mass demonstrations against a ruling by the military regime.

DIPLOMATIC SANCTIONS ASKED

The Johnson administration was urged by New York's two Senators yesterday to continue withholding diplomatic recognition and economic aid from the new military regime in Argentina until it receives evidence that democratic processes will be restored.

In separate statements, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, a Democrat, and JACOB K. JAVITS, a Republican, called on Washington to show in prac-

July 11, 1966

14403

arouse China, but we should not condemn those leaders who point out such possible dangers.

Sensing in his article suggests throwing things in Fulbright's face—using our fighting back in Pearl Harbor and our action with the Berlin Air Lift as justification. It is absurd to even attempt to make comparisons between our situation in Viet Nam and that of Pearl Harbor and West Berlin.

In one, our people and our security were directly attacked with tools and men of war without any room for equivocation as to the intent for such attack. In the other, in Berlin, a right was being denied us which the world knew we had and were entitled to by virtue of Americans already having fought and died to help bring about. It is absurd to try to show equal comparisons and irresponsible journalism to try and appeal to a reader's same degree of patriotism was felt because of the Pearl Harbor attack.

The difference is: on the one hand our liberty was in jeopardy by direct intervening forces—on the other, as in Viet Nam, we are intervening and many Americans are wondering if the latter is justified even though we want it to be in the cause of freedom.

There is one thing for certain—Never before in the history of man, until recent years, did he have the ability to completely destroy himself. This ability exists today and whether we like to think about it or not we should, perhaps, sometimes need to be reminded of this in no uncertain terms.

Because of this grave fact, the American people are entitled to know all the facts pertaining to such commitments as we have made in Viet Nam. The American people should be allowed to decide whether or not we feel we have sufficient national resources, man power and wealth to commit them all anywhere in the world, especially when it is done in the cause of an assumed "fight for freedom," where there is insufficient evidence to know the majority of the people want our help. If there is clear cut danger to our freedom, by all means let's fight back and leave no reason to doubt that we won't, but let's have a lot of public committee hearings by our leaders on situations like Viet Nam before we become too involved.

Can we support many Viet Nam operations without eventually resorting to our great nuclear power? Is it not conceivable that we will be exposed to more than one such Viet Nam commitment and possibly all at once time if we don't examine our present policy? Aside from a few Australians and a substantial number of South Koreans, where are our allies in this action? Even the committed member nations of SEATO? (Many are hauling supplies that help our enemy.)

We are involved in a sticky mess unparalleled in the history of our republic, and a nation of people that has built what we have certainly are intelligent enough to review the situation from all aspects without condemning those that seek to help present facts to help us focus on the overall picture.

The simple facts are: we are in constant danger of war with China because of getting involved in something which has not been sufficiently proven that the justification matches the potential hazards and the degree of their consequence.

We do not want to be an aggressive nation, nor ever have to use our vast nuclear power, yet simple arithmetic should reveal to all of us that a nation of 200 million would have little chance of defeating one of over 600 million in a conventional war, where our supply lines would have to reach and be maintained half way round the world. We would almost certainly have to use our nuclear weapons, and once we "push the button" deterrent forces might very well, out of fear or for whatever reason, push theirs.

Though it might be unthinkable, this is a real possibility and should it ever occur, the "point of no return" may well have been past

for all mankind. There may be a few moments left to reflect upon the mistakes of man, but no recourse left to correct them.

I believe that people are and need to be better informed than ever before—it is right and proper that we examine and review each step we now take.

There is one absolute certainty upon which we all can be sure of—if we can not correct any mistakes that might have been or will be made and the "button is ever pushed" we will be a long time dead.

Respectfully yours,

LEE R. MCEWEN.

TEXARKANA, ARK.

LOYALTY NOT THE ISSUE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Loyalty Not the Issue," published in a recent issue of the Northwest Arkansas Times. There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOYALTY NOT THE ISSUE

It has not been a question of "whether," but of "when" the administration would charge those in the United States who do not support escalation of the war in Viet Nam are less patriotic than the people who go along with an all-out effort to defeat militarily the powers in North Viet Nam.

The "when" was answered yesterday by Vice President HUMPHREY in an address to the nation's governors in Los Angeles.

Mr. HUMPHREY is quoted as proclaiming "The time has come for some of us to stand up for our country," implying that those who do not see the wisdom of spreading the war are close to being disloyal to the United States.

In the same address, the vice president remarked that it would be "immoral" for this country to "pull out of Viet Nam."

As everybody who has studied the situation knows, few if any of those who are not supporters of the ever-mounting war policy of the administration have counseled withdrawal from Viet Nam. The two stands are not synonymous, regardless of the interpretation of the vice president. And because some do not feel that broadening the war through extension of bombings is a wise course does not mean these people are not "standing up" for their country.

One of the dangers inherent in the Viet Nam situation is that the American people will be led to adopt the attitude that anything goes which will lead to a military victory—even dropping of "the" bomb. Those who have opposed escalation of the war effort have said repeatedly that the United States, the greatest military power in the world, can desolate enemy territory at will in the small and backward nation where fighting is raging. The advisability of demolishing North Viet Nam is questioned, not the ability of the United States to achieve this aim.

And there is no real question of patriotism involved in a difference of opinion as to whether continued stepping up of the war effort is wise or foolish. The vice president's intimations that "halfway" support of the expanding war effort, or direct opposition to such moves, are somehow disloyal are unfair and regrettable.

HOW FIAT CORP. SOLD MOSCOW

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the May 14 issue of Business Week magazine contained an interesting article about arrangements under which an Italian automobile manufacturer will provide goods and services to the Soviet Union for construction of an \$800 million auto

factory. I congratulate the enterprise of these Italian businessmen. It is estimated that as much as \$320 million of the cost of the project will be spent in Italy. This is a very healthy development in international trade.

I regret that our businessmen are not at least sharing in these enterprises and contributing to greater trade and more normal relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from Business Week be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HOW FIAT SOLD MOSCOW

The Italian auto maker's deal to help make cars in Russia will give \$320-million boost to Italian industry. Now France's Renault and Japan's Toyota may follow its lead.

It was about quitting time for factory workers in Turin, Italy, last Wednesday when a peppery little Italian industrialist and a rotund Russian bureaucrat decided to sign their contract and do business together. Then, Fiat's honorary president, Vittorio Valletta, and Soviet Automotive Industry Minister Aleksander Tarasov toasted each other with champagne.

Each had reason to grin. With a stroke of his pen, Tarasov thrust the Soviet Union further into the automotive age than it has ever been. For his part, Valletta plunked Fiat right in the middle of the biggest industrial deal the Russians have ever made with Western companies. It could lead to more of them in Eastern Europe.

Fiat contracted to help engineer and set up a plant in Russia capable of producing 2,000 cars daily, or about 600,000 a year. The cars will be a version of Fiat 124s, reportedly modified with a larger engine (1,400 to 1,500 cc.), more rugged frame, less glass area and better battery shielding as protection against Russian's primitive motoring conditions and harsh climate.

IMPRESSIVE

While the secretive Russians didn't want to talk publicly about money, the deal by any standard is a whopper. Estimates of total cost run as high as \$800-million, although slightly more than half of this may be local expenditures.

Certainly, the Italians came up with attractive financing: Istituto Mobiliare Italiano, the Italian state financing organization, agreed to finance \$320-million of the deal, the part to be spent in Italy. The loan is repayable in 8½ years after delivery of goods at about 6½% interest. About 65% to 75% of the \$320-million will be spent to buy machine tools and other equipment from Italian companies besides Fiat (Tarasov visited the Innocenti machine tool plants and the headquarters of Pirelli, Italy's biggest tire maker). Other orders may be placed with other European and perhaps even some American companies for supply of additional machinery.

Construction of the plant probably will begin next year, with the first cars rolling off the line by 1969 and full-capacity output probably several years later. No announcement of the plant's location was given, but Moscow sources mentioned as possible sites the Moscow area, Gorki, and Zaporozhe. All three are currently centers of vehicle production; Zaporozhe, the Ukraine, also has a steel mill. An estimated 2,000 Italian technicians will be sent to Russia to oversee engineering and construction of the plant.

NEW OUTLOOK

The Fiat deal reflects a changed Soviet attitude toward the passenger car in recent years. Both Stalin and Khrushchev were against private passenger cars on principle on the grounds that they tended to promote a

July 11, 1966

14404

private-enterprise mentality and that they wasted resources. Premier Aleksel Kosygin, however, has said it is wasteful for Soviet officials to ride around in trucks and commercial vehicles. In any case, he ordered Soviet passenger car production increased from about 200,000 a year currently to about 800,000 by 1970. Some of the new cars will become taxis and a few will go to private use, but there is no indication yet that the Kremlin will devote sizable resources to mass construction of roads, service stations, and repair facilities typical of motorized societies in the West.

Since the Fiat plant won't go into quick production, it is expected that the Russians also will expand existing plants—and possibly contract to buy others in the West to reach an output of 800,000 cars by 1970. They have been dicker with France's Renault for a plant with the approximate capacity of the Fiat plant; a Renault mission is to leave Paris for Moscow later this month. Japan's Toyota Motor Co. has had preliminary talks with the Russians on a plan capable of producing 300,000 to 400,000 units a year, and the company is drawing up plans to submit to the Russians this summer. Renault may at least get some of the equipment for the Fiat plant.

THE ORIGIN

Fiat clinched the Soviet deal after four years of trying. In 1962, Valletta flew to Moscow to open a large Fiat exhibit at an Italian trade exhibit there. Valletta met Khrushchev, and the two talked about possibilities for plants to manufacture cars, tractors, or both.

Subsequently, Valletta hosted delegations of Soviet technicians visiting Fiat factories in Turin. Last July, Valletta and Khrushchev's successors signed a protocol for the joint study of scientific and technical problems. While the language was obscure, it was widely believed that Fiat and the Russians were working on a deal for building plants to make autos and tractors.

Nothing more was said about the deal until mid-April when Tarasov went to Italy at the head of a big technical delegation. Almost immediately, Italian sources hinted the deal was close to completion and that the Russians were mainly concerned about technical aspects of the car model and financing. Fiat, according to Italian sources, offered the Russians the 124 model, a new five-passenger four-door sedan with an engine in the 1,200 cc range.

But the Russians wanted a bigger engine. They also didn't like the large expanse of glass, possibly because it would be harder to seal out the Russian cold, and in general they wanted the car to be more rugged. They eventually got what they wanted. Says an Italian auto executive: "The result will only be a second cousin to the 124 model that we know."

BUILT ON EXPERIENCE

Fiat has had considerable success dealing with Communists. Its smallest car is made under license in Yugoslavia, and it has had other experience selling in Eastern Europe. But there may have been other factors in Fiat's success: Italians buy about 20% of Russian oil exports annually, and they are known to have been talking with Moscow for some time about the possibility of importing natural gas from the Ukraine. In any case, the Russians are in a good position to service credits because of their mounting trade surplus with Italy (nearly \$100-million last year).

The deal stirred a flurry of interest in the U.S., although none of the Big Three auto companies—General Motors, Ford, or Chrysler—showed any immediate desire to inquire about the possibilities for following in Fiat's tracks. For one thing, present U.S. policy is to limit credits to Eastern European Com-

munist countries to five years. U.S. trade with Russia is too small to make a Fiat-sized business deal plausible now. Beyond this, the Russians have made no bones of their reluctance to improve relations with the U.S. in any field as long as the Vietnam war goes on. For the same reason, U.S. companies would be wary of making deals with the Soviet Union which could be used against them by their competitors.

Still, U.S. participation in the Soviet automotive industry has a precedent; in the 1920s, Ford sold thousands of trucks and tractors to Russia and later cooperated with the Russians in setting up a large automotive factory at Gorki as well as a smaller assembly plant in Moscow. Many Ford engineers visited the Soviet Union and Russians visited Dearborn, Mich., in those days.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Flight Fast, But, Oh, Those Delays," written by Art Buchwald, which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post. The article is informative, and it should be preserved in the Record. The article discusses the tremendous importance of the supersonic airplane which this Government is sponsoring.

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

FLIGHT FAST, OH, THOSE DELAYS! (By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—"Good day, ladies and gentlemen, this is your captain speaking, and I'm happy to announce that this is the first supersonic flight from New York to Paris. We will be flying at an altitude of 60,000 feet and a speed of 1,800 miles an hour. Our flying time to New York to Paris will be two hours and 45 minutes. Now please fasten your safety belts and we will be ready to take off. . . .

"Ladies and gentlemen, I know you're wondering what the delay is, as we have been on the ground waiting to take off for the past two hours. Unfortunately, air traffic conditions are very heavy at this hour and we have been asked to hold here on the runway. We are now the 20th in line for take-off. . . .

"Well, folks, we've been moving up as you might have noticed and we are now second in line. I'm sorry these last four have been so difficult, but the tower has assured us we will get clearance to take off in the next hour or so. . . .

"May I have your attention, please. It appears that there are more planes in the pattern than was expected, and we've been asked to hold further. Why don't you all relax? I've turned the 'No Smoking' light off. . . .

"Ladies and gentlemen, we've finally been cleared for take-off. Would you all please relax? I apologize for the six-hour delay at the runway, but this is something we have no control over. . . .

"Well, folks, we seem to have broken some sort of record. Our flying time to Paris was two hours and 31 minutes. Unfortunately, there are many planes circling the Orly airport and we've been asked to fly over to Copenhagen and hold there at 55,000 feet. Paris assures us that as soon as it is feasibly possible they will permit us to make an approach. . . .

"Ladies and gentlemen, this is your pilot speaking. Since I last spoke to you 90 minutes ago I regret we have not been encouraged by Paris to come in and they have asked us to maintain attitude and fly in a

pattern over Sicily. The stewardess tells me there seems to be a shortage of drinks and water, so we are putting everyone on rations of one glass of water each.

"Also, I'm sorry to say we have run out of food.

"Some of you have complained about seeing the movie four times, so for the next two hours we'll play stereophonic music instead.

"You'll be kept informed as to our progress. . . .

Folks, this is the captain again. I know you're all very tired and hungry and thirsty and so am I, but trying to knock down my door is not going to help anybody. We should be getting the green light from Paris any time now. . . .

"We've just heard from Paris and we are now in the pattern and will be permitted to land within the next hour. Please fasten your safety belts. . . .

"This is your captain again. As you can gather we are on the ground at Orly, France. Unfortunately there doesn't seem to be any room at the ramp and we've been asked to wait out here until someone leaves. It should not be more than 40 or 50 minutes. . . .

"Well, here we are at the terminal and I hope you've enjoyed your first supersonic flight. I'm happy to announce we beat the Queen Mary's record by four hours and 12 minutes."

STRUGGLE FOR UNITY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on June 11, 1966, I had the honor to speak at the commencement ceremonies of California State College, at Long Beach.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks at that time appear in the Record at this point.

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

STRUGGLE FOR UNITY

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL at commencement ceremonies of California State College at Long Beach, June 11, 1966)

I am highly honored that you should ask me to participate in these commencement exercises of California State College at Long Beach. I share the pride of the people of California, and particularly of the people of this great metropolitan and cosmopolitan community of Long Beach, in all that has been accomplished here, on this campus, in the indispensable cause of higher education, and, beyond that, for what has been accomplished generally for education, and for higher education by our entire state.

Here, students may study and learn, regardless of creed or race. Here all have an equal opportunity to use the brains God put in their heads to think with, and, under the guidance and instruction of a dedicated faculty, to educate themselves, and to develop their own skills and talents.

I am a neighbor of this institution. My home, Anaheim, is less than half an hour from this campus. And it is to this area that my immigrant grandfather came from across the sea, well over a century ago, to be an American, to live out his life, and to raise his family, in freedom.

I give to those who graduate today my earnest and warmest congratulations. You are the products of an educational system successfully created by our society, fashioned by our own unique political institutions, through legislation adopted by democratic processes, and you represent the best hope of the Republic and of our Golden State that this kind of free society, which you know and I know, will endure.

July 11, 1966

form of "compensatory time." The balance, or 17,000 hours of coaching time, constituted unpaid or uncompensated work.

The failure of this District of Columbia school system to pay for extra duty has placed the District of Columbia school system at a competitive economic disadvantage. Teachers have either transferred to another school system in the area which does pay for extra duty, or have left the school system entirely, because they were not being compensated for extra duty.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill authorizes the Board of Education, with the approval of the Board of Commissioners, on written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, to fix an amount of additional compensation for teachers, now assigned a standard workload, who are assigned to perform extra duties on a continuing basis. Such additional compensation is to be paid monthly following performance of service and shall not be subject to deduction or withholding for retirement or insurance, nor considered as salary for those purposes. The bill allows such additional compensation to be paid for more than one activity assigned to a classroom teacher so long as such activities are not performed concurrently.

Section 2 authorizes the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to make necessary regulations to carry out the purposes of the act. Section 3 provides the act shall take effect September 1, 1965.

ANNUAL COST

The committee was informed that the annual cost of S. 2574 is estimated to be \$225,000 for 450 teachers expected to participate. The bill provides the Board of Education of the District of Columbia with the authority to determine compensation schedules and select teachers coming under the program.

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs, on June 21, 1966, held public hearings on S. 2574. At this hearing, representatives of the Washington Teachers Union, the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the District of Columbia Coaches Association appeared and testified in support of S. 2574. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia testified in favor of the principle of extra duty compensation.

SHARP RISE IN PRESIDENT'S POPULARITY REFLECTED IN BOMBING OF OIL DEPOTS IN HANOI AND HAIPHONG

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I note with great interest in this morning's Washington Post, there is published a report entitled "Bombing Raises L.B.J. Popularity: Many Now Expect Shorter War."

The decision to bomb the oil depots of Haiphong and Hanoi has resulted in a sharp increase in the popularity of the President. This reflects what I believe the President has known for some time, that the earlier decline in his popularity was due to what was going on in Vietnam and had nothing to do with the fact that we were doing too much there. Evidently, the people of this country think that we should be doing a lot more there than we have.

It is the view of the American people that we should fight and win the war in Vietnam, or get out. We recognize that the Communist powers have just as much determination and staying power as we have, in a long and drawn out stalemate. It is my judgment that no

President could take this country into a war and fight over a long period of time, pulling our punches, and taking heavy casualties over an 8- or 10-year period, with no hope of ever winning it, and be reelected.

So far as the people of this country are concerned, they want to know why they would have to accept a stalemate when we possess the military capability to overwhelm aggressors and maintain our position.

My judgment is that this country cannot stand a military defeat in Vietnam and remain a major military power, or, for that matter, a major world power at all. Those nations which have not shown courage and fortitude to back up their nation's policies with national will and determination are no longer first-rate powers.

This Nation is the hope of the free world. I personally applaud President Johnson for his decision that we must make the cost of aggression ever greater, that we must make the aggressor suffer an ever pain at the source of aggression, particularly when the United States is committed to help victims of aggression defend themselves.

Mr. President, I notice that those in opposition to the President's Vietnam policy of bombing the enemy's oil facilities, according to the Harris survey as reported in the article to which I have referred, appear to have only 15 percent of the American people on their side.

This is very interesting, in view of the great deal of conversation we have heard from them, as well as the views of powerful newspapers, particularly some in the East, which strongly support the policies of retreat and defeat. Accordingly, when it comes to seeing how the majority of our people feel about this situation, these powerful newspapers and other voices raised in opposition to the President's decision, apparently are speaking the judgments of only 15 percent of the American public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article to which I have referred.

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

THE HARRIS SURVEY: BOMBING RAISES L.B.J. POPULARITY—MANY NOW EXPECT SHORTER WAR

(By Louis Harris)

By ordering the bombings in the Hanoi and Haiphong areas of North Vietnam, President Johnson has sharply reversed the trend of public disaffection with his handling of the Vietnam war to the point where today a majority of 54 per cent of the American public supports his conduct of the struggle. The specific move to bomb the oil depots on the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong meets with better than 5-1 approval of the American people. In actual percentages, 62 per cent are in favor of the action, 11 per cent opposed, and the remaining 27 per cent are undecided. This projects to on 85-15 per cent support for the Administration if the undecided are eliminated.

On the eve of the bombings, the Harris Survey had just completed interviewing a cross section of the public. This study found the Johnson rating on handling the Vietnam war was at a 17-month low with a positive score of 42 per cent. A week later, after

the bombings had begun, that rating has risen 12 points to 54 per cent.

The dominant argument advanced by Americans who go along with the bombings is the hope that it will hasten an end to the war.

By a 6-to-1 ratio, people accept the military need for bombing fuel supplies. A rather high 39 per cent, however, feel the bombings would be harder to justify if they hit civilian population centers. And an even higher 43 per cent of the American people believe that as a result of the new escalation, the Chinese Communists are now likely to enter the war.

In short, it is apparent that Mr. Johnson has gained at least a temporary victory with American public opinion. But he has also taken some serious risks which would later come back to damage his basis for support.

If it is proven out that large numbers of civilians are killed in the new bombing attacks, the President will be severely criticized. If the Chinese come into the war with ground troops, sizable numbers of Americans will hold Mr. Johnson responsible.

But probably the most critical dimension is the overwhelming expectation on the part of the people that these new bombings will "get it over with" in Vietnam. In effect, this puts a time limit on the part of the American people within which they will expect the conflict to be concluded, either by military victory or by negotiations.

The response of the public, it should be pointed out, is partly a matter of hard-headed reasoning, but also contains a sizable measure of emotion born of the long frustration over the war.

Here is the trend of President Johnson's ratings on the way he has handled the Vietnam war since January 1965, in response to the question:

"How would you rate the job President Johnson has done in handling the war in Vietnam—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

L.B.J. handling of Vietnam

[In percent]

| | Good to excellent | Only fair to poor |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Postbombings, July 1966... | 54 | 46 |
| Prebombings, June 1966... | 42 | 58 |
| May 1966..... | 47 | 53 |
| March 1966..... | 49 | 51 |
| January 1966..... | 63 | 37 |
| September 1965..... | 66 | 34 |
| May 1965..... | 57 | 43 |
| January 1965..... | 41 | 59 |

The President's biggest gains have been scored in the South, where confidence in his handling of the war rose 17 percentage points following the bombings. In the East and Midwest, his Vietnam rating went up 12 and 14 points, respectively. In the West, however, the rating rose only two points—from 46 to 48 percent positive.

The trend of public opinion on bombing Hanoi and Haiphong had moved gradually toward favoring such a move over the past nine months. Before the bombings were ordered, the public was asked:

"Do you think the Administration is more right or more wrong in bombing Hanoi and Haiphong?"

Bombing Hanoi and Haiphong

[In percent]

| | For | Against |
|---------------------|-----|---------|
| Post bombings, | | |
| July 1966..... | 85 | 15 |
| May 1966..... | 50 | 50 |
| February 1966..... | 42 | 58 |
| September 1965..... | 30 | 70 |

Perhaps the most far-reaching question for the long run is one dealing with the public's expectations as a result of the bombings:

"It is argued that by bombing Hanoi and Haiphong we can slow down North Viet-

July 11, 1966

bargain sales alone cannot supply the lack. If part of the street crowds rejoice in statuary and vistas, and another part in saloons and strip-teasers, a successful city must appeal to them all, and monotony, even magnificent monotony, will not do it.

So they are placing among the office buildings in Charles Center the first legitimate theater erected outside of New York in 30 years; and they are searching ardently for a restaurant that will make Duncan Hines revise his standards upward.

ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, American wheat farmers continue to pay the price of a self-defeating U.S. trade policy with reference to the sales of American grain to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, mainland China, and other countries with similar governments.

While our Canadian friends are making enormous sales of wheat to the Chinese and the Soviets, we continue to pay our farmers to cut back on production. Why anyone would regard such policies as in the interest of the United States escapes me entirely. This point is very well made in an editorial in the July fourth issue of the Farmers Union Herald entitled "Are We Asleep at the Switch?"

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

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

ARE WE ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH?

Canadians are jubilant over their record breaking sale of \$800-million worth of wheat and flour to the Soviet Union during the next three years. This is the biggest single commercial grain transaction in the history of international trade. Russia will pay in cash as the wheat is put aboard ships in Canada. The entire Canadian economy will benefit.

Canada has maintained normal trade relations with Russia on agricultural commodities for 10 years. It has sold a billion dollars worth of wheat and flour to the Soviets in the past four years, exclusive of the new contract.

Except for the United States, nearly all the rest of the world now buys and sells in the international market with little ideological distinction, at least as far as Russia and the East Europe communist nations are concerned. Congress and some American labor organizations and other groups continue to prevent enlargement of U.S. trade in this area.

President Johnson recently asked Congress for discretionary authority to extend normal tariff treatment to European communist countries when it is in our national interest to do so, but he was rebuffed. Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee, declared that he personally would block such action by refusing to bring up the proposal in committee.

Meanwhile, Italy's big Fiat company has entered into a \$320-million deal with Russia to build an entire automobile factory in the Ukraine. French and Japanese auto manufacturers are negotiating for smaller related contracts. West Germany's Krupp is engaged in a large joint undertaking with Poland to expand industry there. Italian ship builders are constructing vessels for the Soviet. Britain is actively going after Russian contracts. There is strong feeling abroad that normal trade relations promote peaceful coexistence.

It would appear that in the matter of international trade, either all the world is out of step but the United States, or else the U.S. is the one not in normal cadence with the times.

The business daily, the New York Journal of Commerce, says it would be sensible for America to liberalize its foreign trade policies. Congressman MILLS' attitude, it feels, is one of "biting off your nose to spite your face." The communist nations, whether behind the Iron, Bamboo or Sugar Cane curtains, is a small percentage of all world trade, but dollar-wise it is large and growing and there is no good reason why the United States . . . shouldn't have a more adequate share in it."

(Reprinted from the St. Paul Dispatch.)

OUR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, although public attention is usually riveted on the military phase in the struggle in Vietnam, there is another phase to that struggle which is of equal significance and in which we have been making notable progress. I refer to our efforts to bring tangible proof to the people of South Vietnam that their future will be better than their past. Our progress in this other phase of the struggle in southeast Asia will be just as decisive a factor in determining the outcome as any military success, no matter how spectacular.

President Johnson has said:

In Vietnam communism seeks to really impose its will by force of arms. But we would be deeply mistaken to think that this was the only weapon. Here, as other places in the world, they speak to restless people—people rising to shatter the old ways which have imprisoned hope—people fiercely and justly reaching for the material fruits from the tree of modern knowledge * * *. It is, therefore, our task to show that freedom from the control of other nations offers the surest road to progress * * *. But it is not enough to call upon reason or point to examples. We must show it through action and we must show it through accomplishment * * *.

It is those accomplishments in South Vietnam, of which I think the American people are too little informed, which I would like to review briefly here today.

Our economic and social assistance to Vietnam began in 1954. Since that time, we have spent more than \$2 billion for nonmilitary aid to the people of South Vietnam. And despite every effort by the Vietcong and the Government in Hanoi to frustrate or destroy economic advances in the South, we have achieved great gains.

In the last few years, hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese farmers and their children have been reached through the efforts of American farm experts. They have been given improved seeds and cuttings of onions, corn, sweet potatoes, and sugarcane, as well as fertilizer and pesticides, to increase their crop yields. Insects and rodents formerly destroyed 30 to 40 percent of the crops in South Vietnam; by bringing such pests under better control, we have already saved nearly 100,000 tons of food.

Since 1954, thanks to American assistance, the people of South Vietnam have added 250,000 hectares of irrigated land

to their agriculture. Last year, Vietnamese commercial fishermen caught 368,000 tons of fish, compared with 165,000 tons in 1959.

With U.S. encouragement, the Ky government has introduced new land reform measures. Permanent land titles have been given to peasant farmers now holding only provisional claims to the land they till. Some 500,000 acres of former French lands are in the process of being sold to small farmers on terms which they can afford. Another 700,000 acres of state-owned land will soon be distributed among 180,000 landless Vietnamese, most of whom are refugees from Vietcong-controlled areas.

At the end of this past April, incidentally, there were 933,000 such refugees, of which about 500,000 were still living in temporary shelters. The others have either returned to their villages or been relocated.

U.S. direct-dollar assistance provides construction material, medical facilities, clothing, personnel costs, and nearly \$8 million in food-for-peace commodities.

Progress in the fields of health and medicine has been equally impressive. Twelve thousand five hundred village and hamlet health stations have been established and stocked with medicines. Despite Vietcong harassment—and health workers are a favorite target, which speaks volumes about the sincerity of the Vietcong's campaign to help the people of South Vietnam—the incidence of malaria has been held to 1.57 percent. More than 80 percent of the Vietnamese population living in malaria-infected areas are now protected from this disease.

New clinics and surgical facilities are now scattered throughout the nation. We are helping to build a medical school which will graduate as many doctors every year as now serve the entire civilian population of South Vietnam.

In education, we have also made great strides—again against the direct opposition of the Vietcong, who do not hesitate to destroy a new school building at the slightest opportunity.

When South Vietnam first achieved its independence, its educational system was run for the benefit of privileged classes. That is no longer true. Primary and secondary school enrollment in South Vietnam has quintupled. By early 1968, 13,000 new hamlet classrooms will have been built providing facilities for 780,000 schoolchildren. We have assisted the Government of Vietnam during the past 3 years to distribute more than 7 million text books. U.S.-supported programs in the hamlets of Vietnam are now graduating 2,500 instructors a year. Facilities are now available to provide Vietnam with 1,700 new elementary or secondary teachers every year, and more than 5,000 Vietnamese teachers have returned from health, agricultural, educational, and other studies in the United States and around the world.

Since 1962, U.S. aid has established four polytechnic schools and three vocational agricultural high schools. More than 10,000 Vietnamese students are now receiving vocational training that will

have a profound effect on modernizing Vietnamese agriculture and industry.

When Vietnam was divided, the south possessed very little industrial capacity. Most of the industry was in the industrialized north. Today, there are more than 700 new or rehabilitated factories, ranging from textile mills to electronics manufacturers, which are part of a steadily expanding industrial base in South Vietnam.

Last year, alone, the United States financed 8 new industrial plants, and 51 expansions of existing facilities involving more than \$7 million of imported equipment.

I believe that this is a highly creditable record—and it must be remembered that all this is going on under the tremendous handicap of a nation at war. None of it, of course, would be of any avail if the Communists were to succeed in their campaign of violence and aggression. Our military effort in South Vietnam is the indispensable shield behind which our economic and social efforts and the efforts of the Vietnamese people—can be carried forward.

But we have not waited for the cessation of hostilities to begin the works of peace. We are even now attacking with all our strength the basic problems of illiteracy, poverty, and disease, which are the true breeding ground of communism and, indeed, the source of most of the violence that occurs in any society.

This second phase of the struggle in southeast Asia will continue long after the military phase has been brought to a successful conclusion. What the people of Vietnam want is peace and a better life. Neither they nor we nor any other nation can hope to secure a lasting peace if we fail to honor the just and imperative demands of millions of people on this planet for a better and brighter tomorrow.

I think it important that the American people—and the other peoples of the world—understand that the United States is today pursuing both ideals. Those twin goals are, in fact, the basis of all our foreign policies—and I believe that we are drawing steadily closer to the achievement of both.

SEVERNA PARK STUDENT DESIGNS CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have often risen on the floor to praise young Americans for their achievements. I would like to do so again. In the State of Maryland, the Anne Arundel County Community Cultural Center is being designed by a 17-year-old high school student. This young man, Gregory L. Martin, was selected to design the building as the result of a "talent hunt." He has thus been launched on an architectural career. It is gratifying to know that young men like Mr. Martin are achieving bigger and more important things at earlier ages than ever before.

I would like unanimous consent to insert into the Record an article from the Baltimore Evening Sun regarding Gregory Martin and his project.

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

METRO YOUTHS IN THE NEWS: SEVERNA PARK STUDENT, 17, DESIGNING CULTURAL CENTER

(By David Runkel)

The first Anne Arundel County community cultural center is being designed by a high school student.

Gregory Lee Martin, 17, a senior at Severna Park High School, is drawing up the plans for the center, the main part of which will be a theater in the round.

The center is slated to be built within the next year on the shores of Lake Waterford near Pasadena. The county Department of Recreation and Parks will provide the funds to build the center and will partially finance a repertory theater company, which according to plans, will offer one play a month.

Young Martin, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Larry Martin, 10 Admiral road, Severna Park, was selected to design the building after a "talent hunt" in county high schools by Joseph L. Dorsey, recreation and parks department officials. The department got the idea from a florist in the county who had a student design his new store, according to Mr. Dorsey.

GIVEN FREE HAND

After selecting Martin, department officials "sat down with him and told him what we wanted." He was given a free hand from there on, Mr. Dorsey said.

Martin submitted his preliminary plans several weeks ago and the department made a few minor changes. The final plans and blueprints are now being drawn up by Martin, with the assistance of his shop instructor, Roger Willis.

The design for the building is still basically Martin's, Mr. Dorsey said.

More than half of the one-story building will be taken up by the theater. The stage will be 18 feet by 18 feet and will be 2 feet off the floor. There will be seats for 150 persons on all four sides, Mr. Dorsey said.

OTHER USES

Other parts of the building will be used for a ticket booth, lobby, rest rooms and locker rooms for persons using the athletic fields behind the center.

Beside the repertory company, Mr. Dorsey said, the center will be used for meetings, lectures, art exhibits, concerts by the county junior symphony and ballet recitals by county-sponsored ballet classes.

Start of work on the center will depend upon finances. There is some money in this year's budget for the project, but the exact construction cost has not been determined, Warren W. Kershow, department head, said.

It might be possible, he added, to use Neighborhood Youth Corps volunteers to get the building started. If everything goes according to schedule, the center could open in less than a year, Mr. Kershow said.

MALNUTRITION AS A FACTOR IN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we hear so often about lack of appreciation for our humanitarian efforts in the world that I felt special note should be taken of a dramatic "thank you" message from 17 million children of Latin America—the beneficiaries of the Operation Ninos school feeding programs sponsored by the Agency for International Development as part of the food-for-peace role in the Alliance for Progress.

The message, extending thanks to AID, the U.S. Senate, the House of Representatives, and to the American people, was sent on behalf of the 17 million children by 150 delegates from 17 countries who participated in an important meeting in Panama City from June 19 to June 25.

Another giant step has been taken in

the direction of combating malnutrition among the children of the Western Hemisphere, and of increasing local government and private sector support of child feeding efforts, as a result of this Panama meeting, called "The Conference of the Americas on Malnutrition As a Vital Factor in Development."

Headed by President Marco Robles, of Panama, who keynoted the conference with opening remarks, delegates from government, private industry, and private voluntary relief agencies and international agencies reported, debated, exchanged ideas, and collaborated in calls for new actions to be taken on behalf of the children of the hemisphere.

The conference was held under the sponsorship of Operation Ninos, the AID-sponsored Alliance for Progress program which has helped bring about an increase of over 400 percent in the number of children being assisted in organized feeding programs in Latin America in just a little over 3 years.

Among the highlights of the conference were the following:

A keynote address by His Excellency Marco Robles, President of the Republic of Panama in which he underscored the importance of combating malnutrition in order to promote individual health and happiness and community and national development.

An address by the Honorable Graham Purcell, of the Agricultural Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, in which he reaffirmed the pledge of the United States to work together with those nations possessing "a national will and determination to help themselves."

A report on the nature and magnitude of the problem worldwide, demonstrating the irreversible nature of physical retardation brought about by malnutrition in the preschool years.

A report on additional research which continues to provide support to the evidence that child malnutrition may produce an irreversible mental retardation.

A paper by the Honorable Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for Material Resources of the Agency for International Development, and delivered by the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Material Resources of the Agency for International Development—Mr. John W. Johnston, Jr., in which he stressed the role of the private sector and called on governments to create a climate conducive to private investment in the "war on hunger."

In response to Mr. Waters' speech, a resolution by acclamation to send a message of gratitude to the American people from the 17 million children of the Americas benefiting from food-for-peace programs.

A call for greater quantities and improved quality of local food production by Dr. Moises Behar, Director of the Institute of Nutrition for Central America and Panama—INCAP.

A call for development of national food policies by the Latin American regional director of UNICEF, Dr. Oscar Vargas Mendez.

Presentation of a newly developed set of audiovisual aids to be used in local nutrition education programs.

Today, a bill was introduced in the Senate which seeks to end this strike by compulsory arbitration. I want the Record to be perfectly clear that I oppose the bill in its present form.

It would be a sad day for America if we began to straitjacket employers and unions by imposing upon them a compulsory arbitration program. That is not the method to retain economic freedom in this country.

Mr. President, neither this dispute nor any other dispute of which I am aware between management and labor would justify, in my judgment, the passage of compulsory-arbitration legislation aimed at one specific, ongoing dispute. The whole subject of emergency disputes procedure needs review and revision. But it should not come when industry and the public are caught up in the heated atmosphere of a given work stoppage.

BOMBING OF HANOI AND HAIPHONG

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, although administration spokesmen are traversing the world in an effort to justify the expanded American bombing of North Vietnam, the effort will not gain approval or win support from the dozens of countries and millions of people alienated from the United States by our war policy in Vietnam. The explanations and justifications at the official level silence governmental criticism. But they do not gain anything more for the United States than acquiescence from nations simply unwilling to get involved.

If foreign response to our bombing in Hanoi and Haiphong is adverse, a good part of the reason may be found in the testimony of Secretary McNamara last February to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I am certain that the President of the United States does not know that his own Secretary of Defense answered him in advance of the bombing in Haiphong and Hanoi, for I read the testimony given by the Secretary of Defense in February. In discussing the supplemental military authorization Secretary McNamara said:

Secretary McNAMARA. Most of the petroleum used in North Vietnam comes by way of Soviet vessels into Haiphong, and there is Chinese commerce as well into the port of Haiphong.

Senator ERVIN. So they could cut down a number of the essential supplies that would come in there by mining the harbor.

Secretary McNAMARA. Essential supplies, perhaps, to the economy of North Vietnam, but not essential supplies to the operation in the south.

The tonnage that is required in the south, as I indicated, is relatively small, and it is not necessary for it to come in by port or, for that matter, by railroad or even over automotive roads. It could be carried on the backs of men, as it has been done many times before by the Chinese.

Senator ERVIN. But the North Vietnamese would be unable to send those supplies down there unless the industries could keep going.

Secretary McNAMARA. No, sir. The industries in the north contribute very little to the supplies that are used in the south for the prosecution of the war.

Senator ERVIN. They would contribute to taxation, would they not, to the support of the Government?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, sir.

Senator ERVIN. Which is operating and directing the war in the South.

Secretary McNAMARA. No, sir; I do not believe so. The industry in the north is so small that it plays a very little role in the economy of the north, and I think any of the analysts who have studied the problem would say it could be completely eliminated and not reduce in any substantial way the contribution of the North to South Vietnam.

Senator ERVIN. And you are telling us, am I to infer, that you could wipe out the entire industry of North Vietnam, and have no effect whatever upon their capability to prosecute the war?

Secretary McNAMARA. It might affect their will to do so. In my opinion, it would have no measurable effect upon their capability to furnish the supplies they are presently supplying to the Communist forces in South Vietnam.

Senator ERVIN. What do they do with their oil and gasoline that comes in?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes—they use it for the operation of their aircraft which, so far, have played practically no role in combat operations in North Vietnam. They use it for fuel for their trucks, some of which are used on the infiltration routes.

The portion of fuel used by their trucks could be obtained even though we were to mine the Haiphong and Hon Gai harbors. And, if they got no fuel for trucks, they have demonstrated many many times before that, in the Orient, they can move the quantities of supplies now being moved into the South by animal and manpower.

Senator ERVIN. Well, it would seem that North Vietnam is entirely unessential to this war, according to your testimony.

Secretary McNAMARA. No, it is not unessential. They are supplying the leadership, they are supplying the cadres, they are moving the equipment obtained from other Communist countries.

Senator ERVIN. Don't you think a massive air attack on North Vietnam would have a vast effect on the will of the people to continue to fight.

Secretary McNAMARA. No one can be sure how they would react. I do not believe that it did in Japan and I do not believe that it did in World War II, and I do not believe it did in Korea.

I think a study of the record will show that massive air power by itself did not break the will of the people nor did it break the will of their political leaders.

It was airpower, massive airpower complemented by ground and sea action, that broke the will of the people and their leaders.

It is difficult for me to reconcile this testimony of the Secretary of Defense with the President's ordering of the bombing of Haiphong and Hanoi, so-called essential oil deposits, and other military targets. In fact, it is difficult for me to reconcile this testimony of the Secretary of Defense with his present statements, in which he is supporting the President in the bombing.

However, Mr. President, the world knows the costly mistake that the United States has made by this shocking policy in North Vietnam.

I say to the American people: "Your intelligence is being insulted by the officials of your Government, when they seek to lead you to believe that civilians are not being killed in Hanoi. Read the foreign press. It is not a kept press. Read the foreign press to get the truth about the shocking outlawry that the President of the United States has imple-

mented, in what I consider to be an inexcusable course of conduct on the part of our country in the killing of civilians in this escalated bombing in Hanoi and Haiphong."

It is the assumption in official Washington, as reported in the press, that bombing industry in North Vietnam will have relatively little effect upon the northern war effort, but may induce them to quit the war unless they can get further help from the Soviet Union or China or both.

If they do get help, our privileged sanctuaries in Thailand, the Philippines, Okinawa, Japan, not to mention Hawaii and the continental United States, could be privileged no longer, as we move into World War III.

But suppose she does not, and suppose North Vietnam drops out of the war? Every evidence, past and present, is that the Vietcong will continue warring against Marshal Ky or anyone else the United States puts up.

The administration is fond of asking what solution its critics have. But I ask the administration, How do you propose to keep a Ky government in power except by perpetual warfare by Americans, and by keeping hundreds of thousands of American boys in South Vietnam, none of whom should ever have been sent there?

If there is a national goal to be served in Vietnam that is not to be questioned, then let the administration set it forth in a request for a declaration of war, and a justification for it. Then we can all know what the facts are, and what our purpose is.

But let us not hear on the Fourth of July weekend, as we just heard across the country when we celebrate a document dedicated to "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind" and Government deriving just powers from the consent of the governed, that all facts, opinions, and decisions of war and peace are vested in one man, the President of the United States.

They are not. The decision of war or peace is vested only in Congress by our Constitution, and it has not been exercised. Our President has failed to follow the responsibility under article I, section 8 of the Constitution that he owes to the American people.

I hope the day has not come in our land when the actions of one man—however powerful—are beyond discussion, debate, and disagreement. If it has, then we are far down the road where Government operates without benefit of constitutional limits and procedures.

Under present policy, the best hope we have in Vietnam is for indefinite occupation of the country by half a million Americans. Every minute carries the danger that North Vietnam and China will extend support to the Vietcong of the magnitude we have extended to General Ky.

Such a situation is fraught with World War III. Far from avoiding that danger, it enlarges it, for what inducement would it be if half a million Chinese or Russian soldiers came to occupy Mexico to the south of us. It would be no inducement to peace! It would be an incitement to war.

July 11, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14495

This is not a labor dispute which in any way threatens the existence of the union or jeopardizes the precious right of collective bargaining. The International Association of Machinists is one of the strongest unions in our country and has a long history of industrial statesmanship which it cannot justify besmirching by this unnecessary, uncalled-for strike. This union owes it to the President of the United States to respond to his fine and fair statement of yesterday by announcing immediately that the union will call off the strike for a two-week period so that the mediation hearings can proceed in an atmosphere of calm reason, free of economic duress.

As the President has so often quoted in connection with other emergencies, "Come now, and let us reason together," so, too, in this emergency the same advice should be followed by the representatives of both the union and the airlines with the men back at work and the airplanes flying on schedule.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have the statement by President Johnson printed in the RECORD, together with two editorials from the New York Times which point out the reasonableness and equity of the recommended settlement by the emergency board which I headed.

They are the only statements I made. A reading of the statements show that the Washington Post needs proofreaders.

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

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON, JULY 7, 1966

I have just been informed of the breakdown in negotiations between the five airline carriers—Eastern, National, Northwest, Trans-World and United Airlines—and the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, and of the decision of the Union to strike the carriers.

The serious implications of this dispute make it imperative that the parties try to reach a prompt settlement. At my request, Assistant Secretary of Labor Reynolds will get in touch with the parties immediately and reconvene them as soon as possible. I am sure that all the American people share my deep concern over this matter and the conviction that the parties must do everything within their powers to bring about a settlement promptly.

I am disappointed by the failure of the parties to reach agreement and by the decision of the Union to strike. I am particularly concerned that our essential military needs be met, that the important space work at Cape Kennedy be continued, that the inconvenience to the travelling public be held to a minimum and that mail deliveries continue with the least interference possible.

I have asked Acting Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance to make certain that all military requirements for air transport are fully met and to report to me immediately if any problems arise.

I have requested Chairman Charles Murphy and the Civil Aeronautics Board to take all appropriate action to provide needed airline services with the air carrier remaining in operation.

I have directed General William McKee, the Federal Aviation Administrator, to cooperate in every way possible with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I have requested Chairman John Bush and the Interstate Commerce Commission to take all appropriate action to provide the maximum available rail and bus transportation to minimize the inconvenience to the traveling public.

I have instructed Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien to use every available

mode of transportation to move the mails as rapidly as possible, particularly to our servicemen in Viet Nam, and reduce to a minimum any delays in mail delivery.

On April 21, I established an Emergency Board under the Railway Labor Act to investigate this dispute and to make findings of fact and recommendations. The Board was composed of Senator WAYNE MORSE, David Ginsburg, a distinguished Washington attorney, and Richard Neustadt of Harvard University. When the Board reported to me on June 7, I transmitted the report to the parties with my strong recommendation that they settle their differences within its framework. At that time, I expressed by belief and the belief of my advisers that the Board's recommendations formed "the framework for a just and prompt settlement, which is in the national interest." On June 13, the carriers informed me that they accepted the recommendations of the Emergency Board. Since that time, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and Assistant Secretary of Labor James Reynolds have been working with the carriers and the Union to bring the dispute to a conclusion without a strike and with a fair and just settlement for both parties.

I have done everything within my power and have taken every action available to the Federal Government to minimize the inconvenience to the public resulting from the strike, but the basic responsibility to the public rests with the Union and the airlines.

They have a great responsibility to the traveling public and the public will expect them to live up to that responsibility.

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1966]

TILTING THE GUIDEPPOSTS

Far from smashing the Administration's wage-price guideposts, the recommendations a Presidential emergency board has made in the airlines pay dispute may have given the much-battered anti-inflation standards the kind of flexibility they need for survival.

The board, headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, made a great point of its determination to ignore the guideposts. These are aimed at keeping the over-all level of wage increases in balance with the long-term rise in national productivity of 3.2 per cent a year. Under the Morse board's proposals, 35,000 mechanics employed by five major airlines would get annual increases averaging 3.5 per cent.

The recommendations were arrived at by considering a wide array of factors, including "the public interest in the maintenance of a stable economy." Perhaps the most interesting of the panel's specific proposals was that the union be free to reopen midway through the contracts forty-two-month span, if living costs next year go up faster than they have over the last five years.

The recommendations point the direction in which the Administration must go if voluntary restraints are to have any real chance of working in the wage field. The guideposts were never intended to operate as ironclad pay limits; their original formulation in the 1962 report of the Council of Economic Advisers emphasized that no single standard would be practical for all industries.

It is plain that gains in productivity represent the foundation for a noninflationary wage policy. It is equally plain that such a policy will be hard to sustain unless Government fiscal and monetary policy combine to hold the general price level steady. The airlines report provides a realistic approach to both elements of the stabilization problem.

[From the New York Times, July 10, 1966]

AN "UNCONSCIONABLE" STRIKE

The strike by the International Association of Machinists that has grounded 60 per cent of the nation's commercial airplanes has an atavistic flavor. The union, it seems,

cannot be swayed by an objective offer of a fair settlement or by appeals to act in the national interest. It just wants more. And it is apparently counting on the disruption and inconvenience caused by the strike to get it.

There is no question that the airlines are now prosperous. They are benefiting from both a boom in air travel and the widespread use of jets, which have proved for more popular and profitable than they had expected. Their profit figures are not secret; they are in fact reflected in offers to the union.

The machinery of the Railway Labor Act, which applies to air carriers, was first employed to bring about an agreement. But the union refused to accept the National Mediation Board's offer of binding arbitration. Then President Johnson appointed an emergency board, headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, which made proposals that would have provided what Mr. Johnson described as "the framework for a just and prompt settlement." This, too, was rejected. Finally, the airlines made a new offer that reportedly exceeded the Morse proposals; but the union decided to strike rather than to bargain.

At a time when the nation is at war and must be operating all of its air transport, the strike harms the entire union movement and its reputation for responsible and reasonable leadership. The machinists, as Senator Morse has pointed out, are not being asked to make any sacrifice. His board ignored the Administration's wage guideposts, recommending increases averaging 3.5 per cent; it also proposed a reopening of the contract by the union if living costs go up faster than the board anticipated. Given these concessions, Morse holds that the strike is "unconscionable."

Conceivably, the union's strategy will succeed in getting it more. But the machinists must recognize that excessive demands can provoke an excessive reaction. If they hold out for a settlement that is uneconomic for the airlines and inflationary for the country, they will surely provoke demands for action to curb union power.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is frequently reported in the coverage of the union position in this dispute that the leadership is under pressure to bring back a big package settlement to offset raiding of its membership by rival unions. But while these men are not working, they and their union are suffering great economic loss as well as the airlines.

This is why I believe it is to the interest of all parties, not to mention the public interest, that the IAM go back to work while mediation and bargaining continue. The strike and lockout are the ultimate weapons of labor-management relations. There is no issue at stake between the Machinists and the airlines that justifies resort to ultimate weapons by either party. The issues belong on the bargaining table, not on the picket line.

No one would fight harder for the right to strike and to lock out than would the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, the union is not in any way jeopardized in this dispute. No attempt has been made to eliminate the union. No attempt has been made to deny to the union the precious right of collective bargaining. In my judgment, the union is misusing its power and right to resort to economic action.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. The answer is not a strike, it is not a lockout, and it is not compulsory arbitration.

July 11, 1966

For the years since the end of World War II, we have been strong enough to intervene almost at will in foreign countries. From the Caribbean to the Middle East, Europe to Asia, we have put large U.S. military forces wherever we thought some American interest was threatened. Some 350,000 of them are still in Europe. Fifty-five thousand are still in Korea. Roughly a million fight or serve outside the borders of the United States. This is creating a very bad image for the United States around the globe.

This cannot make for stable international relations. It can only produce resentment and a will to drive us out, either diplomatically as France is doing, or by whatever other means are available.

This is why I oppose the continual build-up in southeast Asia. It does not protect the men there—it jeopardizes thousands upon thousands more in areas where our normal commonsense should tell us the United States cannot hold dominion except by constant war and increasing use of American military power.

The American people must not stop thinking and talking about our position in Asia. Short of a declaration of war, it cannot be a closed issue.

I have received a letter from two constituents in Merrill, Oreg. The writers circulated it to several people. It closes with a footnote addressed to me. I shall read a part of the letter:

DEATH IN VIET NAM

MERRILL, OREG.

June 12, 1966.

Yesterday we received notice that our grandson, Tommy Chatburn, aged 23, was killed in action in Viet Nam. He lived with us here in Merrill and we loved him as our son. On his last furlough before going to Viet Nam he talked with me about his plans for after the war.

In his last letter to us Tommy wrote that he would be coming home in August or September, and maybe sooner, and we counted the days as we know he did.

He is coming home all right—in a casket. I can see him now through my tears coming through the kitchen door.

Oh God, how many other brave boys will be sacrificed before the people put an end to this useless killing!

It wouldn't be so hard to take if our boy had died for his country or for a worthy cause. But he didn't.

We have no more business over there than the people over there have over here.

Tommy died a victim of the attempt of the Johnson Administration to impose a military dictatorship on the people of South Viet Nam through our hand-picked, hated, little and cruel tyrant, Nguyen Cao Ky.

What reasons are the American people given for waging this war on a hapless people in a small impoverished country half way around the world? These are the reasons given:

(1) We are there to defend the people of South Viet Nam against Ho Chi Minh.

(2) We are there because we have made commitments to the government of South Viet Nam, and have been invited over there.

(3) We are there to fight Communism, to prevent its spread, and to stop a Communist take-over of South Viet-Nam.

As to reason No. (1), the people of South Viet Nam do not want us to defend them any more than we would want them over here to defend us.

The people of South Viet Nam demonstrate against us, carry signs that say, "Yanks go Home", burn American buildings and vehicles, dance in glee around the burning property and mob and shoot at our people. What else can they do to show they want us to go home and leave them alone? They hate us and our puppet, Ky. No wonder! Wouldn't we hate them if they were over here? The only Vietnamese people that want us over there are the puppets, prostitutes, and profiteers.

It is obvious the people of Viet Nam are against us and helping the Viet Cong. How else could the Viet Cong put up such a fierce fight against the might of the United States? South and North Viet Nam is one country—not two countries—and Ho Chi Minh is its leader. He is a national hero. He led the fight against the French. The French were trying to do the same thing we are trying to do. After 10 years they were defeated and gave it up. They say that we are stupid to try to carry on this war.

Our Tommy wrote shortly after arriving in Viet Nam, "These people don't want us here."

And yet Johnson insists we are there at their request only to defend them; that we want nothing for ourselves. How stupid does he think the American people are?

When Viet Nam was divided into two parts in 1954 by the Geneva Accord Agreement, the people of Viet Nam were told that the division was only temporary and that there would be a free election to give the people a chance to choose their own government. This commitment was broken for the reason that at least 80% of the people would have voted for Ho Chi Minh and against us and our puppet. This is the estimate of President Eisenhower, who was then president. The percentage against us now would be greater. We again promised a free election; but again the election has been postponed and our promise broken.

As to reason No. (2), relative to our commitments to the Government of South Viet Nam, since when did Johnson start keeping his commitments? What about his commitment to the American people not to escalate this war? He condemned Goldwater as being the war party candidate and held himself out as our best hope for an end to the war. Millions, including the undersigned, voted for Johnson on that basis. Then he betrayed us.

Furthermore, our commitment was to defend the government of Ngo Dinh Diem. Diem was our hand-picked puppet. But he was too hard to handle. So, with our consent and by our connivance Diem was assassinated. Thirteen other puppet dictators have fallen since then. It is hard to find a reliable puppet who will take orders from the United States. When we tell the world that we are not dictating to the government of South Viet Nam, these puppets start believing it and start giving orders on their own. So they don't last long!

If we were being invaded, every man, woman and child would spring to the defense of our country. So will the people of the countries we invade. They will fight like wildcats, just as our people would under the same circumstances. That is why we will never be able to "win the people" of South Vietnam as Humphey and other Johnson men say we must do. Could they win us if we were in their place? Not in a thousand years! We would never submit to foreign subjugation, and it is doubtful that they will.

The Johnson policy of bomb, bribe and blackmail will never work. We are now the most hated country on earth, and Johnson is probably the most hated man on earth, and this hatred is building up.

As to reason No. (3)—that we are fighting Communism, preventing its spread and a

Communist take-over—this is just as fictitious as the fiction that we are in South Viet Nam to defend the people there.

In the first place, this is not a war against communism. If it is, why don't we fight Russia and China, the sources of communism; and why do we give communist countries like Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, Austria and Czecho-Slovakia millions of dollars every year? Three fourths of the people of the world are Communists. Does any one propose that we wage war against the communist world? We can never shoot communism out of people, nor shoot our form of Democracy into them.

The way to stop communism is to abolish the conditions that cause communism. These are oppression, injustice, cruelty, disease and ignorance.

Our action in Viet Nam is making more communists because it is creating the conditions that cause communism.

The people of South Viet Nam don't even know what communism is, nor what Democracy is; and they don't care. They want to be left alone and this war to end. But if they did know what communism is and they wanted it, is it our business to see that they don't have it? Who are we to dictate to the world? Also,

All Viet Nam is not worth the life of one of our brave boys.

We cannot police the world, and we shouldn't try.

Let us solve our own problems before we try to run the world. If we attend to our own business here in America, we will have a full time job.

Let us keep our boys home, keep our country strong, and not dissipate our strength.

We are not the sole possessors of the atomic bomb, as we once were. We will have to learn to get along with other countries. If we engage in a death struggle with communism, civilization will be destroyed. We cannot survive an atomic war.

Communism is an economic theory. It is a stage in the evolution of government. Economic theories change. Communism in Russia has changed considerably in the last few years, and it will change in other countries. The thing for us to do is to let other countries work out their own problems, just as we went to work out our problems without foreign interference.

Consider the changes during the Johnson Administration in our own country. Our free enterprise system will be a thing of the past if this undeclared war doesn't end soon. No country can wage a major war without adopting a totalitarian form of government. If we continue this sordid adventure in Viet Nam, we will create in this country the very thing that we claim to be fighting in Viet Nam. Johnson already claims the right to send our boys to a lottery of death any place in the world, without consent of Congress. This was the way of Hitler, and is leading to executive dictatorship in this country.

The National Council of Churches, the International Council of Churches and the Pope are all against this war. Johnson's popularity is going down and down. As the war escalates, support for the Johnson Administration decreases.

Johnson and his supporters are sewing to the wind and will reap the whirlwind.

The Administration announces that it is sending an additional 18,000 men to Viet Nam at once. The communists can send 10 men for every one that we send.

We can't win this war!

Neither Russia nor China will permit an American take-over in Southeast Asia any more than we would permit an Asiatic take-over in America.

We state that our boy died in vain in a cause that was not just; and we charge that Johnson, McNamara, Rusk and their sup-

porters are responsible for the death of our boy.

Johnson made a speech in which he said, in substance:

"Why are the people making such a fuss over 1500 American casualties last year, when more people than that die in automobile accidents?"

What a cruel and heartless thing to say! We know nothing can be done to bring our boy back to us. But we hope we can have a small part in helping to stop this useless, barbarous, criminal and sinful killing with its resulting agony, and suffering; and for that we pray to Almighty God.

TOM CHATBURN, Sr.
MYRTLE CHATBURN.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our views on the war in Asia were the same before our boy was killed in action. His death makes us more determined to help stop this useless criminal war, with its resulting agony and grief. We will continue to do all we can to support you. You do not need to answer this as you have a heavy burden. God Bless You.

THOMAS W. and MYRTLE CHATBURN.

Mr. President, I read this letter because it represents the grassroots of America speaking. It represents a disunited America.

Let me say to the President of the United States, who has been making some unfortunate remarks in recent days in regard to the opposition of his critics, that no amount of criticism on the part of the President will silence me. In my judgment, my President is writing a sordid and sorry chapter of American history. If he pursues this course of international outlawry, I will oppose him as long as I sit in the Senate. In my judgment, the course of the President's action must be changed if America is going to survive an honorable place in world history.

Mr. President, the Chatburns who wrote this moving letter to me are representative of millions of Americans who are not going to take the President's course of action. If the President thinks he can get a united America by seeking to make the appeals that he made from Texas over the Fourth of July, he is sadly mistaken.

I want the President to know that there are millions of Americans who will never unite behind him short of a declaration of war, because the President—I repeat tonight—does not have a scintilla of constitutional right to send American boys to Asia to be slaughtered on the battlefield without a declaration of war. Congress has no right to support him in this war short of Congress living up to its constitutional responsibilities of declaring war.

Mr. President, that is the issue. That issue has been drawn in this Republic.

Let me say to the boys who are dying in South Vietnam the very hour that I speak, that we do not have the slightest justification as a Congress—nor does the White House—to send them to their deaths. Those who are letting down those boys are Members of Congress—and the President—who are making available the funds with which to kill them instead of exercising the check on the purse strings under the Constitution by denying to the President the funds with which to escalate the war, and to force him to follow the course of

action of de-escalating the war and follow the recommendations of a General Ridgway, a General Gavin, and a George Kennan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain telegrams, editorials, and articles bearing on the subject matter which I have just discussed.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
July 3, 1966]

WASHINGTON: "COUNT 10 BEFORE YOU HURT"
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 3.—President Johnson said in Omaha that we should count ten before we dissent from his policy in Vietnam. Okay: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10; but it doesn't work. On the Fourth of July, a man is still entitled to a stifled cry, for the Omaha speech is a mishmash of bad history and dubious logic.

"What happens in Vietnam," the President said, "will determine—yes, it will determine—whether ambitious and aggressive nations can use guerrilla warfare to conquer their weaker neighbors. It will determine whether might makes right."

This is quite a proposition. If Vietnam will really determine this ancient dispute about right and might, which goes back to Plato in 370 B.C., every porky middle-aged character in the country will surely want to volunteer for Saigon, but will it settle this or anything else? Here is the basis of the dispute between Mr. Johnson and his critics.

THE PRESIDENT'S VIEW

The President sincerely believes it will. Increasingly he is talking as if Vietnam were one of the decisive battles of the world: stop the enemy there and we've stopped him everywhere. Defeat the guerrilla technique now and we have convinced the enemy and reassured our uniting Asian allies, and for such historic ends, no matter what the cost of sacrifice, "We will see this through; we shall persist; we shall succeed."

Mr. Johnson is escalating his speaking as well as his bombing. He is applying the do or die sentiments of the Alamo (which, after all, was not a glorious success) to one of Walt W. Rostow's latest theories. This is that President Kennedy's stand against Khrushchev in the Cuban missile crisis was the "Gettysburg" of the cold war, and that Vietnam is the Wilderness Campaign—a difficult, untid mopping-up exercise before then end.

Maybe so, but it is hard to look ahead to the end of President Johnson's Administration and imagine this stable, free, cooperative Asian world that will, in his view, be established by the sacrifices of Vietnam.

THE MISSING ELEMENT

If President Johnson told us bluntly that we were in a power struggle to establish a decent order in Asia—which we are—and intended to establish American military bases at Kam Ranh Bay and elsewhere to maintain in Southeast Asia what he calls the "vital security interests of the United States," that, at least, would be a policy. But he has not said that.

He has said that we want to prove to the Communists that guerrilla warfare does not pay, and after they have seen the light and come to the conference table, the United States wants no bases in southeast Asia and will go away leaving the future of Vietnam to the converted Democrats in Saigon and the defeated and intimidated Communists in Hanoi and Peking.

This, with the best will in the world, is hard to believe. It is not a policy but a myth. It is possible that American power will finally smash the main units of the

North Vietnamese Army in the South and disperse the Vietcong guerrillas—after severe casualties on both sides—but it is highly unlikely that this will produce either a democratic order in Saigon or an acquiescent Communist order in Hanoi and Peking.

THE ENDLESS STRUGGLE

The struggle will go on. China will still represent a quarter of the human race. Rhetoric will not change geography. Mr. Johnson may get his "honorable settlement" and get past the election, but what will he have settled, and what will he have achieved that will justify the lives that will be lost between now and then?

The President has already proved to the Communists that guerrilla warfare is an expensive business. He has a chance now to influence the constitutional convention in Saigon so that it will bring in a representative government that will negotiate peace with all the enemies in the field, including the National Liberation Front, but he is not doing this.

Either now, before more and more killing, the Communists are going to participate in a compromise settlement; or later, after our "victory" and departure, they are going to participate in such a settlement anyway. The President, however, does not see it this way. It is awkward politically. It involves a compromise with the Communists which is harder to explain than letting them force a compromise after we are gone. But the cost of fighting on until Hanoi, Peking and Moscow agree to an American conquest on the battlefield is likely to be very great, and the end result, after we leave, not much different.

The President talked at Omaha about fighting for the "will of the people" in Vietnam but the will of the people there, so far as it can be determined, is for peace, while the will of the generals, whom the President is supporting, is for war.

He defended bombing Hanoi and Haiphong on the ground that it was necessary to halt the large-scale infiltration of arms which the previous bombing was supposed to control. He tells us that instead of diminishing the flow of Communist supplies by bombing, the flow of supplies has been increased; instead of human supply trails through the jungle when the bombing started, "the trails turned into boulevards," [which seems a little odd]; instead of small weapons carried on the backs of human beings, "they built all-weather roads . . . they began sending troops in by trucks rather than on foot . . . they shifted over to heavy weapons using imported ammunition, most of it coming from Communist China." And the President's conclusion from all this was that there must be more bombing "at the source", which will probably mean China if the supplies at Hanoi and Haiphong are destroyed.

THE POLITICAL STUMP

Something happens to Lyndon Johnson when he crosses the Appalachian Range. He drops the restraint of the Capitol and picks up the idiom of the political stump. Our soldiers in Vietnam, he says, are not going to fail us; the question is whether the critics are going to fail them.

Count ten, he says, before you let me and them down, before you "hurt." But something is wrong. We count and we don't want to "hurt," but somehow it doesn't work.

[From Newsweek, July 4, 1966]

THE POLLS AND THE WAR

(By Walter Lippmann)

Now that the polls have become such a part of our political life, we are realizing that it is by no means easy to read them correctly. Thus, while the recent Gallup and Harris polls show a sharp decline of confidence in the President, they can be read as meaning

July 11, 1966

that the country is more warlike than the President or that the country very much dislikes the war and wishes to end it quickly.

Mr. Elmo Roper, who is one of the pioneers in the art of polling, has an article in the Saturday Review of May 28, pointing out that polls cannot be used to guide policy and that the test of Presidential leadership "is not in the crucible of public opinion but in the crucible of events." The essential question is not whether the polls are favorable to a policy but whether the policy leads to satisfactory results.

The main reason why the polls are not a good guide to policy is that, as Mr. Roper has observed, so large a part of the public is "uninformed or misinformed about the facts and issues on which national policy is based." There is present, it would appear, an instinctive tendency to rally around the President when he is in trouble abroad. President Kennedy, for example, reached his highest peak of approval in the polls, a peak higher than was ever reached by President Eisenhower before him or by President Johnson since then, just after his fiasco at the Bay of Pigs. President Kennedy never did so well again, even after his greatest triumph in the Cuba missile crisis.

This same phenomenon, that of a rally to the President when he is in trouble abroad, occurred during the Eisenhower Administration. Will it occur again if President Johnson, having escalated the Vietnamese war, fails to win a victory that brings the war to an end? The polls cannot answer this question, for they cannot prophesy. Yet this question is of the greatest interest to practical politicians and indeed to all who are concerned about the coming elections this November.

Hawks and Doves. Presently, the Republicans are assuming that almost universally the Vietnamese war is unpopular; they then assume that the country is divided between those who think it can be ended by hitting harder (the hawks) and those who believe it can only be ended by negotiation (the doves). What is common to both the hawks and the doves is that they dislike the war, want a quick end to it and are opposed to a long war of attrition.

That much the polls do seem to say. Is there any other objective evidence which bears on this conclusion? There is, I submit, the draft and how it is working. For the draft poses choices which involve the lives and careers of the young men of the nation and also the concern of their parents, their friends and their teachers. These choices which the draft compels young men to make cut closer to the bone than the questions of the Gallup and Harris polls.

It is generally agreed that the draft is working unfairly, and Secretary McNamara has not only acknowledged this to be true but is reported to have a large task force at work trying to devise a better system. He is not likely to succeed. For the fundamental trouble is not in the draft system but in the war.

Dangerous and Disagreeable. The trouble is not in the system as it works but in the unpopularity of the war into which the system is drafting men. No system—not a lottery, not universal military training, not a national service corps—can make a war equally dangerous and disagreeable to all young men. What makes a mobilization possible is that enough young men with the support of their parents, their friends and their teachers want to take part in the war.

What distinguishes this war in Vietnam sharply from the other three wars of this century is that it is neither popular nor fashionable to volunteer for it, that it is even viewed as correct and honorable to avoid military service.

This is the point of the baccalaureate address by president Pusey to the Harvard graduating class this year. He pointed out

that "contemporary circumstances has a great deal to do in determining popular attitudes in time of war." In the first world war, "when we were finally called upon to fight, the issues were clear and the cause impelling . . . president Lowell then had to try to prevent Harvard undergraduates from rushing to enlist" instead of "taking officer's training first." There was a similar rush of Harvard undergraduates in the second world war.

But not in this war. "So far as I know," said president Pusey, "no one [and this includes the present Administration in Washington] feels any remotely impelling excitement in being involved in the war in Vietnam."

How men act when there is a choice which may mean life or death is a truer measure of their real convictions than their speeches or their answers to the questions of the pollsters.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
 June 27-July 3, 1966]

ESCALATION: NEITHER PEACE NOR VICTORY

With the bombing of oil storage depots at Hanoi and Haiphong the Viet Nam war has now been escalated another notch. Once again the country is told that only the sternest military necessity and a strong desire to bring about peace negotiations lay behind the decision.

There is every reason to believe, however, that the military results will be negligible—that this escalation, like others before it, will be matched by equal escalation on the other side. Ever since February of 1965 we have been bombing North Viet Nam in order to interdict the support of Viet Cong and South Viet Namese forces in the south. The objective has not been achieved; the infiltration rate is greater today than it was when the bombing began. Why should any different results be expected from the new strikes at the major cities?

As for diplomatic results, Administration officials in the past have acknowledged that bombing the cities might well end any hope of negotiations. We hope they were wrong. But in view of the record of 18 months of air attacks it must be granted that, as Senator MANSFIELD says, the new scale of the war makes a peaceful settlement more difficult rather than less.

It is a curious coincidence, if nothing more, that every American escalation of the war has appeared to come at a time when Hanoi was sending peace feelers, or international efforts for peace negotiations were afoot. A "Citizens' White Paper," as reported in last Sunday's Post-Dispatch, called attention to this fact, and naturally one wonders whether history is repeating itself.

In recent days President De Gaulle, UN Secretary General U Thant and Pope Paul VI all have reiterated the world community's plea for peace. A Canadian ambassador visited Hanoi on a special mission and brought back information which must have been important, since the Administration sent Assistant Secretary of State William P. Bundy to Ottawa for a personal report. A Romanian deputy premier, after visiting Hanoi and Peking, called in the American ambassador in Bucharest reportedly to explore the possibilities of a negotiated settlement.

What if anything has been going on the public has no certain way of knowing. The State Department dismissed both the Canadian and the Romanian contacts with the perfunctory statement that they showed no change in Hanoi's position. But U Thant, who may be a more detached witness, was reported last week to feel that there was hope for peace talks if the United States would accept his recommendation for an indeterminate suspension of air attacks on North Viet Nam.

Instead, the air attacks are expanded and escalated.

The American position is that we will consider ending the bombing only if Hanoi agrees to end its support of the Viet Cong. This is asking for surrender. It is asking for North Viet Nam to end its buildup of ground troops while we remain free to continue ours.

U Thant has also laid down as one of the conditions for a peaceful settlement American willingness to accept representatives of the Viet Cong at the conference table. Secretary Rusk in Canberra said this could not be done because it would give the Viet Cong a veto on a settlement. This, too, is asking for surrender. It amounts to saying that the principal belligerent on the Communist side shall have nothing to say about the terms of a settlement. Why should we be surprised at a Communist refusal to negotiate on that basis?

So the Administration's stated desire for negotiations must remain unconvincing. If you sincerely want a negotiated (which means a compromise) settlement, you do not escalate the war in ways most likely to discourage peace talks. You do not support implacably a military junta in Saigon which is undeviatingly hostile to compromise or negotiation. You do not exclude from the conference table the principal force you are fighting.

We believe the road to a peaceful settlement lies in another direction from that which the Johnson Administration is following. It has been repeatedly pointed out by U Thant, speaking as the conscience of the United Nations: first, a suspension of the air war; next, a reciprocal reduction of hostilities leading toward a cease-fire; and finally, a peace conference at which the Viet Cong shall be represented, whose object would be to restore the principles of the Geneva agreements of 1954—principles founded on the concept of military neutrality for Southeast Asia.

The new escalation does not lead in this direction and neither, in our opinion, does it lead toward some easy victory that will dispose of the Viet Nam problem once and for all. It may increase the cost of Hanoi's military operations as Mr. McNamara hopes, but more importantly it will cost the United States untold sums of good will and esteem around the world.

UNDER A STRAIN

In his farm belt speeches on Viet Nam, President Johnson showed himself to be an overwrought man. The decision to expand the air attack to Hanoi and Haiphong unquestionably placed him under severe strain. Right or wrong, he is entitled to public sympathy in his ordeal, and it must be hoped that a rest in Texas will induce a calmer and more balanced perspective on what remains an unsolved problem.

The nature of the strain is fairly clear. By delegating all the initial publicity on the new escalation to Secretary McNamara, the President sought to convey the impression that this was a purely military decision grounded solely on military considerations. By his voluble self-defense on a political fence-mending trip he acknowledges that it was in large part a political decision too—and the politics of it, abroad and at home, has him worried.

Perhaps it would help if Mr. Johnson could see the matter in somewhat less emotional and primitive terms. When he assumes that the only alternative to endless expansion of the war is a dishonorable retreat, he increases the difficulty of his choices. None of the dissenters in Congress or the country, who anger him so much, really advocates a policy of cut-and-run. The disagreement revolves around how best to attain the objective of a peaceful settlement which the President himself professes to seek with passionate concern.

14500

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 11, 1966

It is ironic and sad that Mr. Johnson should base so much of his case on the impression that to do other than what he is doing would be to betray the hopes of free people around the world who wish to be safe from aggression. The truth is that all of the free peoples that really count both in Asia and in Europe—all the important nations except a few minor client-states—would advise a different course if asked. When even Great Britain is compelled to disassociate itself from this new escalation, it should be clear how utterly isolated the United States is. We are implacably setting ourselves against the conscience of our best allies.

Nobody here or abroad would question the nobility and necessity of a great power's keeping its word, or honoring its commitments. The question is what the commitment really is. The question is whether our obligation runs to the suffering people of Viet Nam, or to a military junta which can survive only by escalated war. The question is how our moral responsibility can best be discharged—whether by seeking a military decision or by adopting objectives and tactics that will make a peaceful settlement possible.

And when it comes to keeping one's word, a great many Americans might suggest that this honorable principle applies also to a President who ran for office on a platform of peace and then became involved in an Asian land war which many of his supporters in 1964 thought they were voting against.

HAMILTON, N.Y.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge every effort keep Congress in session. Vote against escalation of war in Vietnam.

MARY N. BRAUTIGAN.

LEONIA, N.J.,
June 30, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Supporting you in any protest action against President's Vietnam policy.

LERoy and DOROTHY ELLIS.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hanoi bombing insane. We continue to support your efforts and will work to end war.

HELEN NELSON.

SARATOGA, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your courage and wisdom in continuing to ask for negotiation and peace. Not bombs napalm and destruction.

ANN and EDGAR HEFFLEY.

YONKERS, N.Y.,
June 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully suggest you and Senator GRUENING redouble efforts to halt Vietnam insanity before escalation triggers world war three.

ARTHUR FAST.

CHARLESTON, S.C.,
June 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep trying to lessen our shame of official acts.

H. L. RICHARDSON.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
June 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding your concern about Vietnam. I support you right down the line. With you all the way.

JOHN RAGSDALE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your position on Vietnam.

JOEL LEBOWITZ.

DAVIS, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My flag is upside down. Appreciate your stand more than we can say.

ROBERT MCINNES.

EUGENE, OREG.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Oppose bombings, which only prolong conflict, damage U.S. image, and obstruct efforts for world peace.

Dr. and Mr. BARRY F. ANDERSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Copy of the following wire sent to President Johnson, Senators KUCHEL and MURPHY and Representative MAILLARD: "I oppose bombing of Hanoi, Haiphong, all of Vietnam. Please seek peace while there's still time."

SERENA JUTKOVITZ.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are shocked and outraged at today's escalation of the bombing attacks on North Vietnam. We applaud and support your stand.

MARCIA and FREDERICK MORTON.

CENTRAL VALLEY, N.Y.,
June 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support you. Don't stop. You speak for us.

FRANCES and JOHN ADLER.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

The American people will not soon recover from the shame and humiliation of our bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. My flag like yours is at half mast.

GRACE DILLEY.

CUPERTINO, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

We commend you on your stand against the escalation of the war in Vietnam. And support you completely in your efforts to stop the war. We are proud of your courageous stand. God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. MARTIN TAYLOR.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your efforts to stop escalation of Vietnam war. We urge comprehensive withdrawal of U.S. men and material from Vietnam, reaffirm the 1954 Geneva accord.

Mr. and Mrs. W. J. CORR.
VIVIAN GEORGE.
EARL GEORGE.
THOMAS VANERMIN.
JOHN WHITTIG.
HENRY VILLADASO.
RAY JUSTICE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
July 2, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Is there no way to restore sanity to the action and pronouncements of the U.S. Government as it proceeds along paths of barbarity and violence to achieve aims however worthy they may be. The present air war in Asia is illegal and immoral and our very destiny is in jeopardy. Where is our Supreme Court. Where is our Congress which alone has the constitutional right to declare war. What of our commitments to the United Nations. We call on you those of you of integrity and decency who are to speak out, to speak loudly, or we are all lost.

EDITH and MYRON ARRICK.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend your position opposing bombing of Hanoi, Haiphong. Our flag half staff. God bless you.

MARGARET HORN.
JOHN HORN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your position regarding bombings of Hanoi and Haiphong.

Mr. and Mrs. HARRY D. LEVINE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Deeply disturbed by bombing of North Vietnam and escalation of war. You have full support for opposition to this and I am pressuring New York Senators to voice their protest.

MARGARET ADAMS.

SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue fighting. You are last hope for those concerned with national integrity.

R. H. Skolman, Warren Travis, Christopher Curtis, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Wedemeyer, Meruti Achanta, Alexander Duncan, Rosa Morin, Ronald Krempetz, Kirk Frederick, Donna Stelnecipher, Mr. and Mrs. Edward I. Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. Kiriwood Smith, Mr. and Mrs. David Dukes, Mr. and Mrs. Dave Williams, Terry Talley, Laurie Brooks Jefferson, Carol Pendergrast, Win. Pendergrast, Klara Baron, Ann Balaam, Prof. Roger D. Gross, Prof. James C. Dunn, Prof. Wm. R. James.

July 11, 1966

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
July 10, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Following is copy of telegram sent to President Johnson:

"You have led this country into a dirty little war where American boys are being killed and wounded by the thousands weekly. You have dragged our country's international reputation into the mud. You say 'well what can I do?' The answer is, as your friend the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mister Johnson let it be clear I want no part of this folly of growing war, and if you persist, no part of you in the next election. Your former supporter."

DRYDEN MORSE, M.D.,
Cardiac Surgeon.PLAINFIELD, VT.,
June 30, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Deplore bombing. Appreciate your protest please continue to speak.

ALAN and MARGERY WALKER.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.,
June 30, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support your stand against the administrations Vietnam policy. Prof. and Mrs. E. KERRIGAN PRESCOTT.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,
June 30, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding bombing Hanoi Halphong. Every patriotic American who loves his country should this day hang his head in shame. JANE ERICKSON.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
June 30, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In times like these when the individual feels helpless and hopeless in the face of ever increasing escalation your consistent denunciation of our war madness may yet reach the minds and hearts of the American people and awaken them to the peril that confronts our shrinking world. You have the gratitude of many of your countrymen for your courageous outspokenness.

MARTIN and LILLIAN WEITZLER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 30, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Many of us members of committee for a sane nuclear policy admire your courageous stand against the bombing of Vietnam. With bombing of Hanoi danger of war with China has increased. Urge you and colleagues of similar opinions continue your utmost to bring about adherence to Geneva Convention.

CLARA CARSON.

EAST CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent, Deplore increased bombing. Urge Congress stay convened for thoughtful discussion of our Vietnam responsibility.

JOAN CULVER.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Just wired President Johnson my disgust at bombing Halphong Hanoi please protest also.

CATHERINE ROLLINS.
St. Louis, Mo.,
July 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please intensify your heroic protect of administrations Goldwaterite bombings and tactics in Viet Nam.

MORTON RYWECK.

SANDS POINT, N.Y.,
June 30, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Worried about escalation I applaud your courageous efforts for peace.

MRS. DORIS LEONARD.

DALY CITY, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your intelligent statements after we escalated the war again. Please continue to speak out. Your voice is my voice. Our boys are dying in vain in Vietnam. We must face that fact.

GEORGE MENDENHALL.

CONCORD, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend and strongly support all efforts to halt escalation of war; lay ground for negotiations.

MILDRED PARTANSKY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Most heartening to again hear your views on Vietnam. Thousands of us continue to support you.

MRS. CHARLOTTE S. GRUNIG.

DETROIT, MICH.,
June 30, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday you spoke for us and almost everybody we know. Congratulations.

R. M. GOODMAN,
JAMES LOGAN,
MIKE LAVEN,
GEORGE BEDROSEAN,
DEAN ROBB,
Members of Michigan Bar.SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for having the courage to examine the validity of U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam. We are proud to have you in the service of our country.

MEDRIC and RUTH GODBOUT.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

This war is increasingly more barbaric. Your forthright statements are reassuring and fully supported.

Mr. and Mrs. DALIEL LEITE.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
July 1, 1966.Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We voted against Goldwater. I'm afraid we voted for Johnson, but not for dictatorship. Think.

ROBERT F. and LUCY M. STOX.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST WATER
RESOURCES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, of great concern to the Pacific Northwest States are the problems, both natural and man-made, of water resource management.

Recently Mr. Oliver C. Larson, executive vice president of the Portland, Oreg., Chamber of Commerce, called to my attention a resolution of June 9, 1966, adopted by the chamber on the subject of water quality control relative to the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Larson also directed to my attention an excellent article entitled "Water: Use It or Lose It," written by Mr. E. A. Higginbotham, chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce. This article deserves consideration not only by Senators of the Pacific Northwest, but by Senators representing all other States throughout the Nation. Mr. Higginbotham sets forth very convincing arguments concerning present and future needs of the Pacific Northwest for the water flowing through its streams. He serves warning as to the disastrous consequences for the Pacific Northwest and the Nation as a whole which would result from any major diversion of Pacific Northwest waters for use in other areas.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Higginbotham's article also be printed in the record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

Whereas the congress has expressed through the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, an interest in maintaining satisfactory water quality for the use and well-being of its citizens; and

Whereas such benefits can be realized through the augmentation of low flows which can be provided by multiple-purpose water resource development projects; and

Whereas in spite of large expenditures by communities and industries for adequate at-source treatment of wastes there is a need for such augmented flows; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation's Tualatin Division of the Willamette Basin Project as originally formulated includes provision for a material improvement in the quality of low-water flows in the Tualatin River as an orderly element of overall water resource development in the Willamette River Basin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Portland Chamber of Commerce favors the inclusion of water quality control as a specific primary function of the Tualatin Division. And be it further resolved that when water quality control benefits would be of a widespread and general nature, consistent with the wording of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and not subject to adequate identification of specific beneficiaries, the Chamber of Commerce favors its inclusion as a nonreimbursable function of water resource development projects.

JUNE 9, 1966.

EXHIBIT 2

WATER: USE IT OR LOSE IT

(By E. A. Higginbotham, chairman, Water Resources Committee, Portland Chamber of Commerce)

The people of the Northwest have long accepted the many rich benefits that nature has bestowed upon them. One of these major benefits has been sufficient water for their needs. There has recently been a growing awareness of the fact that these water resources will have to be handled with greater regard for conservation . . . that this resource is not unlimited.

Last summer, the people of Oregon became alarmed when the water level of the Willamette River dropped so low the fish life was endangered. The Bonneville Power Administration recently issued warnings that low water this coming winter may cause curtailment of some power to industry the following summer.

In the midst of all this, there was a suddenly rising clamor from the Southwest to divert some of this precious water to their dry lands.

Much of the general public, when they hear about the Southwest's wanting to take their water, simply laugh and shrug their shoulders. The whole subject is unthinkable! Water is one of the main reasons for most people living here. It is what attracted, and is attracting at an ever increasing rate industry to the Northwest.

People would naturally assume that their political leaders would simply say "No!" to any ideas of depleting their water resources.

THEY CAN TAKE OUR WATER

There is the joker in the deck! The Southwest *can* take our water. It is not our water. We may have to give up some of this vital natural resource. We very likely will be sending some of the Northwest's water to the Southwest in the not-too-distant future. The question is, "How much will we have to say about the amount and method of diversion?" The real danger is the apathy of the private sector of our area. They must be informed and aroused to the danger.

The Northwest can lose its water by a vote of Congress. All 50 states have a vote on what we would consider a regional problem. The Southwest states have political power for outweighing our four Northwest states.

So, then, what can we do?

The first thing is to recognize that Congress will listen to a *united* people who speak with reason and with knowledge.

The Southwest states have been fighting with each other over water for years, but they have now found a common cause. They are united. And they are being heard by Congress today.

We of the Northwest have yet to find a common ground on which to unite. Oregon has established a Water Resources Board and is making a five-year study of our needs. Washington and Idaho have not yet done so.

Since facts are the only weapon with which to fight, let's take a look at some of the things that affect the situation as we know it now.

Does the Southwest need our water?

There are some very potent facts to indicate that they have plenty of water. Only 10% of their water is now being used for municipal and industrial purposes. The other 90% is used for irrigation. In other words, they have a great surplus of water for drinking, for cooling, for swimming pools, and for all industry. So the question becomes, "How far is it economical to send water for agricultural purposes?"

Since it will cost the taxpayers of the nation billions (*estimates have run as high as \$20 to \$30 billion*) to divert Columbia River water—the most commonly spoken of source—they are entitled to know what the Southwest is doing to conserve water they now have.

In the Southwest, irrigation water is now flowing in many cases in unlined canals where water seepage and evaporation cause an estimated 50% loss. More canals are being lined, it is true, but only a small fraction of what is needed; and evaporation in their hot sun is still a great loss. When pipe is considered as an answer, they say it is too expensive—as though billions of dollars for diversion were not.

THE REAL SHORTAGE: CHEAP WATER

It would appear then the shortage is not just water but is really a shortage of *cheap* water. On some federally financed irrigation projects, farmers pay less than half the cost of delivering it to them, while industry pays high unsubsidized rates. So, while there is no shortage for industrial use, it is certainly no mystery why they would like to cheapen water, also.

So far, the Southwest has not been able to agree on the amount of water they feel they need. In discussions, the amount varies from 2.5 million acre feet to 8.5 million acre feet with 15 million acre feet becoming a more common discussion figure.

There are dozens of bills before Congress all leading toward diversion of Columbia River water. Now, even Texas has introduced legislation that would include them in any diversion; and they feel they need 13 million acre feet as a starter. This was met with consternation by the other Southwestern states who did not approve of someone else muscling in on the act and perhaps adding their crowning touch that would topple the whole scheme.

The Northwest need not be fooled by any agreement asking for seemingly small amounts of water; because, once a diversion system is built, it would be no problem to convince lawmakers who bought the original idea that greater amounts of water were needed. It's just like the man who convinces himself that he needs just one cocktail—the second is much easier!

THE NORTHWEST WATER SHORTAGE

Since the Northwest states have only about 6 million acres under irrigation *out of a potential 25 million acres*, wouldn't it seem more reasonable to irrigate the areas closest to the water supply to its fullest potential before any water whatsoever were sent over 1,000 miles to do the identical job?

Stories and photographs of abandoned home and farms in the Southwest can be matched in the dry areas of the Northwest. But the important question for taxpayers to consider is . . .

How much tax money should be used to bail out the man who goes into the wrong business in the wrong place?

One of the favorite phrases in the Southwest is that we "waste millions of acre feet of water into the ocean at the mouth of the Columbia River." Actually, our average annual discharge into the ocean is 168.3 million acre feet, but it is certainly *not* wasted. It is some of the most efficiently used water in the

world—with a still greater potential for future use.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

The generation of electricity is one of the Columbia's most valued uses. The Northwest has a voracious appetite for electric power, and hydroelectric power is the most efficient available today. Yet, within about ten years, we will have developed all the economical hydro sites. However, our needs for power will continue to double every ten years for the foreseeable future—which means we will have to turn to thermal generation of power. The most likely source will then be atomic power generating steam. Yet atomic power needs lots of cooling water; so, even after hydro development ends, we will be using Columbia River water to good advantage.

The week this article is being written, the first section of the giant Intertie to divert electricity from the Northwest to the Southwest goes into operation. Certainly, the Southwest has a very real interest in our ability to continue as a dependable source of power. The Bonneville Power Administration recently said that, in less than 25 years, 99.6% of the average annual flow of the Columbia at The Dalles will be needed for power generation.

The Northwest states were recently dropped from the list of possible sites for the atomic accelerator while California remains on the list of six remaining sites to be considered. This atomic accelerator requires large amounts of cooling water. Wouldn't it be ironic if we ended up cooling the installation—but not having it?

One point that needs to be made clear is that amounts of water flowing in the Columbia can vary. Sometimes to extremes. For example, the annual average is 168.3 million acre feet. Yet, in 1926, the flow was only 85.5 million acre feet; in 1931, it was 88.4 million; and, once every 150 years, it drops below 70 million acre feet. Such extremes will occur again.

Now, presuming we have diversion going on during such an extremely low water period, who would turn off the faucet? Would the Southwest farmer be content to do without water for that one year? I doubt it!

THE INTERNATIONAL ISSUE

There has been seemingly little attention paid to the international aspects of this whole idea of diversion from one water basin to another.

Almost one-third of the Columbia River's flow—50 million acre feet a year—comes from Canada! The principle of discussions with Canada on development of this international waterway is well established.

In 1961, the U.S. signed a rather comprehensive treaty with Canada on development of the Columbia River basin. It is headed "The Columbia Treaty"—and then says "Treaty Between Canada and The United States of America Relating to Cooperative Development of the Water Resources of The Columbia River Basin."

In Article II, Part I, it says, "Canada shall provide in the Columbia River basin in Canada 15,500,000 acre feet of storage usable for improving the flow of the Columbia River."

In 1964, under an additional agreement with Canada made a part of the treaty, a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the state of Washington (Columbia Storage Power Exchange) was required to pay to Canada \$254.4 million for the following storages to be built in and by Canada:

The Duncan Lake Storage, to be in operation by April 1, 1968;

The Arrow Lakes Storage, by April 1, 1969;

And The Mica Creek Storage, by April 1, 1973.

Section B of the treaty, referring to the above storage development, says:

"Under the terms of the treaty, Canada is entitled to receive from the United States

east central Europe for self-determination and freedom from Communist tyranny is a factor that can too easily escape the allegiance of our alertness during this time of major focus on the war in Vietnam.

I urge my colleagues to avoid this potential oversight and wish to call to their attention the annual observances of Captive Nations Week this July 17 to 23.

The problems of the captive east central European nations belong in the forefront of international issues. Let us not so quickly forget the difficulties we have been so long exposed to because of Communist objectives in Europe. We must not focus so intently on the Vietnam situation that we forget our obligations to encourage and support all efforts to free these captive peoples from their totalitarian regimes.

Any tendency on our part to readily accept news of liberalization in Communist East Europe as a sign that the threat to freedom in that area has ended is a tendency mistaken in its identity of the overall objectives to which this nation has pledged itself.

The peoples of east central Europe are still denied fundamental human rights. Communism still maintains its stranglehold of the minds and bodies of 100 million people in this area. The woes of the captive peoples in Europe have thus not subsided. They remain a subject for major consideration in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

I urge my colleagues to renew their vital interest in the welfares of these captive millions and to endorse that part of the Captive Nations Week 1966 manifesto that accuses the Soviet Union of violating "its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during or after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania."

Balance the Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, George Todt, widely read political analyst of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, and a solid supporter of Ronald Reagan's campaign for the governorship of California, recently wrote an interesting column of sound advice for all Republicans nationally. I take pleasure in calling it to the attention of the Congress and the country by having it printed in today's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Todt makes a valid and important point by suggesting that those who defected from the Republican Party in 1964 should scarcely be entitled to lead or control it in 1968. He argues effectively against those in our party who would endeavor to purge from party leadership any segment of the party and suggests the mantle of republicanism is broad

enough to encompass all citizens sincerely concerned about the drift toward centralized paternalism which is so evident in America today.

He also implies that the Republican Governors of 17 States out of this country's 50 who presume to embrace for themselves the right and the power to name our National Republican slate for 1968 are a bit too intoxicated by their high offices when they attempt to set themselves up as our party's spokesmen and kingmakers. After all, the delegates to our National GOP conventions rather than either our party's Governors, Senators, or Congressmen have the authority to write party platforms and to nominate candidates for President and Vice President. In the meantime, there surely must be some problems of statewide importance and significance which might better occupy the time of our country's Governors rather than having them devote so much time to playing politics in the big league and attempting to determine proper foreign policy toward Vietnam and appropriate techniques for fighting the military actions of that area.

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

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

BALANCE THE ELEPHANT

(By George Todt)

"I shall denounce no good Americans in my campaign. There has been too much friction inside the GOP between right, left and center in the past. We all must be tolerant of our differences and unite our total efforts for final victory."—Ronald Reagan, June 25, 1966.

A great deal of opposition and chagrin is being mounted inside important segments of the Republican party at the GOP governors meeting here at the Century-Plaza Hotel.

They seem more intent on calling the presidential nominee in '68 than getting on with the most important job—which is to improve the national image now.

Leave it all to the governors at this early date and why even bother to hold a national convention two years hence?

Or how could any future delegate expect to get hold of credentials unless first he passed a "moderate-liberal" saliva test?

Why not just wrap up the nomination and hand it to Gov. George Romney of Michigan without further ado?

A SIGN AHEAD

There are at least several important reasons why the GOP—including the august governors of 17 states—ought to "Stop, Look & Listen" first.

In the first place, the "liberal-moderates" (these names are fairly interchangeable and neither rates first in order of priority) are able to command little more than 30 per cent of the party faithful.

That was the way it was at the 1964 convention in San Francisco. And that was the way it was recently in California when Ronnie Reagan—a temperate conservative beat George Christopher by a whopping 68-31 per cent.

What cost the Elephant victory in 1964 was not a matter of the much-maligned, anti-Socialist philosophy of Barry Goldwater—but the defection of 8 million "liberal-moderate" Republicans who voted for Lyndon B. Johnson. They took a powder!

LIKE AN ARMY

A major political party is like an army, with a right wing, center and left wing. In 1964, the whole left wing of the GOP took off—all 8 million of them. And it made a

gap of 16 million between Johnson and Goldwater.

If the 8 million GOP defectors had stayed home and voted for their party candidate, the arithmetic would have looked like this: 8 million added to the 27 million Goldwater received would have totaled 35 millions.

Conversely, 8 million subtracted from the total of 42 million received by Johnson would have left him 34 million and a deficit of one million votes.

A potential Republican triumph was surrendered because of petty differences by 8 million GOP defectors to their party standard bearer.

A LESSON HERE

For this action, the "moderate-liberals" have no real claim to first place on the 1968 ticket. Granted they know how to muddy the waters, take the party down to defeat if they please. Is this required leadership?

No, it is not. On the other hand it is not good statesmanship in the GOP to refuse to allow the left wing due representation. Give it second place.

An ideal Republican ticket in 1968 for those without axes to grind on the ideological front, might be the temperate conservative Richard Nixon named to the No. 1 spot and Gov. George Romney as Veep.

This would balance adequately the overall ticket between the far weightier GOP conservatives and the accompanying 30 per cent of "liberal-moderates." Had Goldwater done so, he might have won.

Can a needed lesson be learned here?

Solution to Vietnam War—and Strategic Deterrence for Peace—Lies in Antimissile Nike-X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired, former Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy, addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on June 24, on the subject "Solution to Vietnam War—and Strategic Deterrence for Peace—Lies in Antimissile Nike-X." A summary of his address, as published in the Commonwealth, follows:

SOLUTION TO VIETNAM WAR—AND STRATEGIC DETERRENCE FOR PEACE—LIES IN ANTI-MISSILE NIKE-X

Friday Flashes—June 24th

(From address by Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired, former Judge Advocate General of the United States Navy)

Because the lock was not put on the stable door until after the nuclear missiles had been sneaked into Cuba, scores of millions of Americans were subject to danger of imminent nuclear incineration. From that horrendous peril, we were, in the words of the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, "saved only by the grace of God and an aerial photograph."

Any solution to a major Communist threat must meet four tests: (1) political possibility; (2) financial feasibility; (3) strategic soundness, and (4) it must not start a nuclear war or allow people to think it will.

The solution I suggest for Vietnam, I think, meets these tests.

It is politically possible because it requires no escalation in Vietnam. It does not widen the war into Laos or Cambodia, it doesn't in-

July 11, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3579

But there are deeper mysteries. Microbes do not get diabetes. Men do. And yet the knowledge gained from genetic studies with microbes may provide by far the most powerful approach to the elimination of this disease from man. Diabetes may well be traced to a defective gene somewhere on that immensely long coil of DNA. Some day we shall have the ability to correct this biochemical defect, and diabetes, and possibly other diseases, will be a thing of the past.

The application of the concepts of molecular biology is even more difficult to visualize however in the case of the chronic degenerative and metabolic diseases. There certainly will be no easy solution to these problems. In fact it is probable that their solution will depend on our first utilizing molecular biological concepts to determine the underlying causes of these disease conditions.

What are the most likely causes of these chronic degenerative and metabolic diseases? My scientific colleagues tell me that it is often possible to identify one or more regulatory processes that are out of balance in these diseases—but they cannot usually distinguish which "component" in the complex biological control network failed first, and which systems are merely readjusting to compensate for the primary malfunction. This kind of problem has sometimes been called "systems biology"—the biology of the complex, self-regulating control mechanisms that manage the house that DNA built.

Indeed it is worth noting that this moves us beyond the genetics aspects of molecular biology and involves a molecular visualization of all of the biological events of the body. For example, a visualization of energy transfer at receptor sites involved in smooth muscle control coupled with new drugs acting at these sites has led scientists in our laboratories towards a promising new approach to the management of hypertension.

Of course all this portends the beginning of an exciting new phase of medicinal product research in industry laboratories, rational rather than empirical, sophisticated beyond anything previously practiced, costly, adventuresome—but the objectives for mankind are magnificent. Now the door is open, or at least ajar, and it is not impractical for the pharmaceutical industry to consider taking on any of the ills the flesh is heir to. But brilliant as are the breakthroughs that make these considerations possible, the road ahead for the industrial researchers who must now create new drugs for the relief of human suffering in a long one. A good deal of this work can now be done with considerably greater hope of success, but much more basic new knowledge is needed if we are to satisfy within a reasonable time the high expectations for progress in health now freely discussed throughout the world. And so the basic knowledge seekers and the product researchers alike have their work cut out for them in the years ahead. I am implying, of course, that there are a number of groups at work and I think that needs some further comment.

Up to this point we have been talking about the technical breakthrough in contemporary medical research. We should not however overlook the changes in the politico-economic atmosphere in which this research has been carried out. Perhaps the single most important factor in medical research since 1950 has been the impressive growth of both Federal and private support, and the developing patterns of interaction between the three parties in the health research community, that is, government, the universities and industry. For example, the National Institutes of Health which do or sponsor most of the government research in the health field increased their expenditures from \$73 million in 1950 to a budget in 1966 of \$1.3 billion. The pharmaceutical industry in this same sixteen-year period increased its expenditures from \$39 million to an esti-

mated \$355 million. In this connection it is important to understand that while there has been an increasing tendency toward government support of research through contracts with industrial laboratories, to date this amounts to something less than 5% of the total funds expended by the pharmaceutical industry for health research.

Traditionally, most government-supported work has been devoted to the development of basic knowledge and the training of young scientists but—spurred always to move faster—there has been an increasing tendency for government to work on or support work directed to the discovery and development of specific products. Concurrently, industry has found it necessary to supplement its traditional product discovery and development role with an increasing amount of basic knowledge research to help fill some of the gaps in knowledge to which I have just referred. And so the traditional lines of demarcation between government and industry in medical research are becoming blurred.

It is timely to look again at our respective roles, not only because of obvious political and economic connotations, but also to achieve the greatest efficiency in our effort to reach the challenging health goals being placed before us by the present Administration.

In hearings earlier this year before the House Committee on appropriations for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Chairman, Congressman Fogarty, asked Dr. Shannon, Director of National Institutes of Health, where he thought "the line" was between government and private industry in health research. A part of Dr. Shannon's reply was as follows: "Industry feels that the Federal dollar should be spent in two ways: One, in the support of fundamental research, and two, in the development of broad scientific competence as the basis for the educational process. They feel, in our economy, that industry is there primarily to do the developmental work leading to a product with full patent coverage. With a competitive system this is the best way they can operate.

"Indeed, I agree with them in many fields. I think there are certain fields in which they do not have the broad competence, that they do require extensive involvement with the Federal laboratories and with the academic world. It is this type of thing that we feel we play a very important role in."

As I interpret this reply, Dr. Shannon backs the traditional view that government, in the main, should support what I have been calling basic knowledge research as well as the training of young scientists, and that industry should be called upon to discover the new drugs and develop them for use in any field in which it has competence. The reference to competence is surprising. As an example of its application, Dr. Shannon referred to the history of viral vaccine development as showing in his opinion that industrial capability had not been developed to a sufficiently high point in this particular field to assure that new knowledge would be rapidly applied by industry without government help and support. But even under these circumstances, Dr. Shannon went on to say that: "Industry is an absolutely essential component. Industry must be involved and very early. They have a very important role to play. But there are certain areas where the individual corporate bodies cannot go it alone." (p. 274)

This may be true. Who can say that the need for joint action in special circumstances may not be indicated in the busy years ahead? And so it is difficult to disagree with this concept. There will probably be more debate about its application than about the concept itself. One of the problems will certainly be who is to decide the competence of industry with respect to the application to new drug research of a new piece of basic

knowledge. But rather than worry this thought any further today, let us concede the need in some circumstances for joint action, and when collaboration is clearly warranted, let us plan for it as a whole-hearted, cooperative effort.

In summary, then, I believe that there is a pressing need for a substantial enhancement of the infrastructure—if I may borrow a term from the economists—of basic knowledge and of trained people in the health research field. This calls for a massive effort which is beyond the power of industry alone to supply. The government is already substantially supporting this infrastructure, and in doing so releases the energies of the private sector to do what it does best; to discover new drugs and to develop their application in the practice of medicine.

Government does and can accomplish its role with its own research effort, but more importantly by financing university projects. There may also be times when the government can discharge its role by contracting for fundamental research by industry, where industry is, for special reasons, the best fitted for the job. Finally, as I have just mentioned, I think we should acknowledge that there may on rare occasion be special circumstances that would require government support of industrial medicinal product discovery but this would be considered the exception, not the rule, in delineating the responsibilities of those concerned.

I would like also to suggest that the government, in developing the research infrastructure, should pay primary attention to the training of scientists. If one factor is to be singled out for major emphasis, this is surely the one and this means strong support of the universities. In this connection the goals of government should be not merely to support to an optimal level the major centers of academic excellence, but also to help smaller universities become adequate centers for the training of scientists and the generation of useful knowledge. It is, of course, essential in stressing the importance of government financing of university efforts to realize there must be a limit. The universities must not lose their freedom and independence of action. In this paper I can only point this out but its brief treatment here does not suggest my own minimization of this important question.

A program for the development, principally by government and the universities, of a broader infrastructure of basic knowledge, made freely available to anyone, and of trained scientists, will create the platform for a tremendous forward thrust in new drug discovery and development beyond anything heretofore imagined. And to accomplish the latter is the primary responsibility and the special skill of industry, operating in a competitive climate. Some visualization such as this of the division of responsibility between the three participants in health research, it seems to me, is essential to our continued rapid progress as a nation in the health field. It is an attempt, in a time when there is so much to do to suggest the need for each group to concentrate on the thing it does best.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming desire of the captive peoples of

July 11, 1966

volve the use of American seapower to blockade the coast or mine Haiphong.

It is financially feasible, because it does not require additional dollars in Vietnam nor investing any money that wouldn't be invested if the Communists had never tricked us into Vietnam.

SOLUTION WON'T START NUCLEAR WAR

Will it start a nuclear war? No. For the first time it will give us a defense against nuclear attack. It will vastly strengthen deterrence against nuclear war.

I do not criticize Secretary McNamara, I am in awe of the man and fear the man. I am in awe of the man because he is spending a billion dollars a week and, last November, after spending \$300 billion, finally said that we are starting not to lose the war.

His idea in Vietnam is to pursue the policy of persuasion—the theory that by continuing to shoot North Vietnamese soldiers as Ho Chi Minh feeds them into South Vietnam, we can persuade Ho to stop the aggression.

We are only killing about four thousand a month, but they are being infiltrated into South Vietnam at the rate of 7,750 a month.

A critical point is that North Vietnam executes more of its own people than we could kill in two years. They do not have a high regard for human life.

TAKE WRAPS OFF AIR FORCE!

Another alternative, which military men favor, is to decide to win the war and go ahead and win it. There is practically no question that this can be done.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force stated in December 1965 that the war against North Vietnam could be won and North Vietnam destroyed virtually overnight if the President would permit the Air Force to do it. By virtually overnight, he later explained, he meant something on the order of three weeks. He is not talking about nuclear weapons, nor killing millions of civilians, but just of taking the wraps off the U.S. Air Force. There is no question that our air and naval power can defeat North Vietnam, leaving the Vietcong with no place to go.

Only about two weeks ago, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet advocated a naval quarantine of Haiphong, and said that, once given orders, the Navy could do it in a day or two.

APPEASERS FEAR RED CHINA

The apostles of appeasement and accommodation say that this would not end the war—that Red China and perhaps Russia would come in.

Would winning the war bring China in? If the Chinese thought they could get into the war without suffering unacceptable results, they'd be in already. They're highly vulnerable in many ways.

Bombing fifty targets in China would wipe out more than half the urban Chinese, including all the key people in government and industry. And we could destroy their newly developed nuclear production complex.

As to Russia, either we have the Soviet Communists deterred or we do not. They don't need an excuse to start a war. We are the one obstacle to their complete domination of the world. What keeps them from attack is their fear of our retaliation.

FOR HANOI?

Do you really think the Kremlin will sacrifice Soviet Russia to nuclear rubble for the sake of Hanoi? We should go ahead and win.

I feel Congress should carry out the Constitutional mandate and recognize the state of war that exists.

They tricked us into it. Remember that their motor torpedo boats attacked the Seventh Fleet. They were shelled in return, but no other response was made. Since they didn't get much reaction, they attacked again. The President had to retaliate be-

cause he was in the midst of a Presidential campaign.

It was deliberate provocation. There was no military value in attacking the Seventh Fleet or in attacking our compound and bombing the Embassy.

We owe it to the men who are going there to be shot at to recognize that a war exists.

It will have a tremendous effect in cutting down the number of lives lost needlessly. It will have a great effect on the men who are there. It will have a great effect on the home front. It will make actual treason, legal treason. It will unify the country. Americans have always pulled together in war.

It would have a terrific effect on the enemy. If we declared war, they would know we were there to stay and we would win.

REDS TRAPPED US INTO SPENDING BILLIONS ON SMALL ARMS

Why have the Communists trapped us into this situation? The answer is obvious now, but was not then. It was to trick us into spending scores of billions on tactical weapons—on aircraft, helicopters, ground materiel, anything useful in small war, and to reduce spending on strategic weapons.

You can detect the strategic aim of the enemy by the type of weapon he wants you to produce, or to stop producing. If the Communists intended to conquer the world on the installment plan, by small wars, they would not have us spending billions of dollars on the weapons to meet these wars.

What they want to do is to divert us from spending money on the big strategic weapons that will deter them from world conquest.

Expenditure on our strategic weapons is down 43%. Our spending on research and development of latest weapon systems is \$1½ billion less per year.

TRICKED US INTO ORBITAL MISSILE BAN

Meanwhile the Soviets are building late model strategic weapons. They are building an advanced system of orbital missiles.

They tricked us into the test moratorium, and again into the U.N. resolution against orbital missiles, and we stopped research.

Then last November they bragged about the orbital missiles they had produced, and said, 'ha! ha! ha!'—the U.N. resolution was against the orbiting of such missiles, but it didn't say they couldn't be designed and produced.

The Communists are about to observe the 50th anniversary of the Russian revolution. In fifty years we have never tried to outsmart the Communists.

They were so doggone smart in trapping us into Vietnam that we could turn it right back on them if we were smart enough. The only time American people spend enough to develop defense is when we are in a state of war.

The enemy's objective is Western Europe. Vietnam has no national product. Western Europe, with 340 million people, has a gross national production of 500 billion a year.

NEED MISSILE DEFENSE

There is one way that we can defeat that aim and that is by building a defense against nuclear weapons.

We now have available the Nike-X system. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended that we produce this immediately, they recommended it unanimously two years ago, the committees of Congress favor it, but McNamara won't spend the money.

Nike-X could have 70 million Americans, possibly including you and your family. I don't want to save just 70 million Americans—I want to save 180 million Americans—and the Nike-X, if we had it, could do this too."

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Q: (Hilary H. Crawford) Why did Democrats send Republicans to Saigon to pull rug

from under President Diem? A: The overthrow of Diem was set up by the New York Times and the Washington Post. Despite his achievements he was anti-Communist and you can't have that!

Q: (Russell Warner) General MacArthur said that we should never get in a ground war in Asia. Why did we? A: General Taylor opposed it too. But he commented later, what could we do? They kept on sending in more troops. The answer is to develop the Nike-X. If the enemy saw that when they started a little war, we got ready for a big war, they'd stop. The Nike-X system might cost us \$30 billion over six years—that's peanuts compared to the 70 million Americans a nuclear war would kill. There wouldn't be a question regarding peace in Western Europe if we hadn't worked against the credibility of our nuclear deterrence. If we had said to Russia, "you go across the line and we'll use our battlefield nuclear weapons immediately," they'd never go across. What we say is, "if you go across, we will pause and let you reflect on the seriousness of what you are doing."

Q: Should we bomb Hanoi? A: Hanoi is one great munition factory. It needs to be wiped out. We should tell the population that it will be destroyed and then go to it. By our creeping escalation, too little and too late, we have given them the chance to decentralize. The solution is more difficult now, but still possible.

Q: (R. D. Adams) Do you agree with Secretary of Defense's policy of holding reserves for a possible later duty? A: I never agree with any policy of the Secretary of Defense, because over the years, if he is for it, that's strike two against it. I don't think we need to call the reserves. I think we should pull troops from Europe. They are doing no good there. Across the border are 130 divisions. If anything broke up NATO, it is McNamara, by making it obvious that we would not use our strongest weapons against the Soviet Union, nor our tactical weapons.

Q: (Ralph Johnson) How will the war in Vietnam probably end? A: I'm afraid I know and that is one reason I feel Congress should recognize that a state of war exists. If we don't, the chances are that there will be a negotiation and at the negotiating table will be the Vietcong, and the Reds will take over as they are doing in Laos. Rusk has said that we have offered everything except the surrender of South Vietnam. If that is accepted, we have offered everything except open surrender. Coalition government with the Communists will be a victory by the Communists. If you were a Soviet, and had the problem of eliminating your principal obstacle to world conquest, how would you do it? Again and again you find Soviets blaming the German invasion on American "warmongers." We're the ones they blame for the war in Europe and against Japan. Do you see what that is? To get peace in the world, you have to eliminate the Americans, and to do this, with the least possible danger to the rest of the world, by surprise attack. That is the war plan. The way we can beat this is by building up our anti-missile defense.

Community Hospital Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, with the adoption of medicare, new demands

are arising on our clinic and hospital facilities and there is increasing need for the type of facilities for which a loan program was proposed in H.R. 9256, later included in the demonstration cities bill and now pending in the Senate.

The need for this sort of loan program is described in testimony given before the House Banking and Currency Committee last March 11, by Jerry Voorhis, president and executive director of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Voorhis testimony appear in the Appendix of the Record.

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

TESTIMONY OF JERRY VOORHIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S.A., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 9256, MARCH 11, 1966

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: My name is Jerry Voorhis, and I appear before the committee on behalf of the Cooperative League of the USA, which organization I am privileged to serve as executive director and president.

The Cooperative League is a national federation of all kinds of mutual and cooperative enterprises in the United States. Its affiliated organizations comprise about 16,000,000 different families in their members, and they are owners of their own businesses which serve their needs for insurance, housing, marketing of farm crops, procurement of farm supplies, credit, health care, electricity, and household needs. The purpose of the Cooperative League is to encourage the use of the voluntary self-help method of solving problems which individual families cannot solve alone.

Our support of the legislation before the committee has been repeatedly and specifically expressed by biennial Congresses of the Cooperative League which is the supreme delegated authority of our organization.

The reasons for that support are as follows. Like the Group Health Association of America, the Cooperative League believes in the better and more rational organization of medical care and health services in our country. We believe that there are four basic elements in that more rational and effective organization. One is group practice of medicine by balanced groups of doctors and professional medical personnel. Another is prepayment of the costs of medical care on a budgeted basis so as to bring the best of modern medical care within reach of as large a percentage of our people as possible. A third is preventive, comprehensive, regular care, aimed at maintaining family health and keeping people out of hospitals rather than episodic medical care which is necessarily limited to attempting to cure disease after it has been serious. And the fourth element is the opportunity and the responsibility of groups of our citizens to act voluntarily in the formation of group health plans in collaboration with groups of their doctors and nurses.

Such plans are to be found all across our country, in all sorts of communities, among all kinds and groups of people. Their basic philosophy is that the doctor should be provided with an assured income as a reward for keeping people well instead of having to depend on an uncertain income derived from people after they have become sick.

We support this legislation—H.R. 9256—because we are convinced it is necessary if voluntary constructive action by consumers of health care is to receive the encouragement it should have and to make the contribution to the better health of our people which such action can bring.

Only where the costs of preventive care are already paid and where doctors' income is thus already assured through the voluntary action of his patients—only under these circumstances is there incentive on the part of doctor and patient alike to keep people out of hospitals and thus to check the alarming increase in costs of medical care and the alarming and soon to be aggravated pressure upon both hospital space and hospital costs.

We can submit carefully compiled evidence to show that subscribers to group health plans do have hospital utilization rates which are from 50% to 80% of those of other insured groups in the population.

But for easily understood reasons group health plans face a difficult problem of receiving financing for the physical facilities they need. This has always been true and no one can accurately estimate how much benefit such plans might have brought to our country through voluntary action of its citizens if the financial problem could have been solved.

Such consumer-sponsored plans are non-profit, of course, to begin with. They therefore cannot offer expectation of substantial earnings as security. Second, the doctors' facilities, clinic buildings, and the like, which are essential if such plans are to operate at all, are single-use buildings and therefore not in the nature of prime objects of investment by financial institutions. Third, in many many cases the need is greatest in smaller communities where even if the local bank desires to make such loans, it simply lacks the resources with which to do so unless a guarantee is provided such as H. R. 9256 could give. Fourth, while the members and subscribers to such plans—or the potential members and subscribers to such plans—could and indeed have put up enough contribution to finance the operations of a plan, there are many, many instances where they are quite unable to subscribe the amounts of money necessary to finance expensive modern health facilities.

Let me cite a couple of examples.

First, take the case of a small community threatened with loss of its only hospital and of all its doctors and where families subscribed \$100 each to provide their town with desperately needed modern clinic facilities. Some \$45,000 was needed to complete construction of these facilities over and beyond what could be raised by the people's efforts. In the absence of legislation like H.R. 9256, it took 15 years before these earnest people were able to borrow the funds necessary to supplement their own and to provide the facilities their town needed.

Another case is one where an already established group health plan in a rural area is ready and willing to construct a branch clinic in a neighboring community. The nearest hospital to this community is 30 miles away. And no facilities exist where efficient medical service could be provided or where, in fact, well trained modern physicians are willing to practice. So the need is obvious. The local bank is quite willing to make a loan to finance the needed facility but it simply does not have adequate reserves and is not large enough to take the admitted risk of financing a building which it would obviously have considerable difficulty in selling in case foreclosure became necessary. Were H.R. 9256 on the statute books the local bank could and would make this loan, doctors could be attracted to this community and the health of the people protected.

Many similar examples could be given, both from other rural areas, to which the legislation would give preference and also from cities where labor-sponsored and cooperative consumer-sponsored group health plans could care for much larger memberships if only they could receive the financing for the additional physical facilities they need.

Finally, we submit that with the advent of the medicare program, the pressure upon existing health facilities will be greatly intensified. Indeed something approaching a crisis in this respect may result. What better way of forestalling such a crisis than by encouraging through a loan guarantee program the kind of constructive action on their own behalf which groups of our people are endeavoring to take through developing of group health plans like those about which I have been speaking?

In times like the present it indeed seems the part of both wisdom and statesmanship to encourage voluntary action by the people of this country in attacking and solving their own problems—that of health economics at their forefront.

For these reasons The Cooperative League of the United States hopes that this distinguished committee will report favorably upon H.R. 9256 and the other measures now before you and that they can be enacted into law at an early date.

Rules for Hosts and Guests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, from the editorial columns of the Christian Science Monitor comes a sound and pertinent discussion of the unhappy situation provoked in New York during the visit to this country by King Faisal:

RULES FOR HOSTS AND GUESTS

The uproar over King Faisal's visit to New York was a comedy of errors that should never have happened. Nobody comes out of it with credit—even if it is possible to explain why they spoke and acted as they did. The United States is a great power. It is appropriate that it move with majesty and command respect. King Faisal's hosts in Washington conducted themselves with that in mind. It remains to be seen whether the beneficent effect of their hospitality has been undone by what subsequently happened.

According to a correspondent of this newspaper, the whole thing started when a reporter submitted in writing to the moderator at King Faisal's news conference a question that was intended as a joke. We would have expected journalists with some acquaintance of international propriety—which presumably goes with being a Washington correspondent—to be discriminating and sensitive enough to avoid initiating the kind of charade that followed.

If King Faisal was to answer candidly any question put to him about his or Arab attitudes toward Israel, he was bound to offend those sections of American opinion with a commitment to the Zionist movement. Nobody can take exception to such Americans objecting to any statement by King Faisal criticizing them. But in a wider context, it should be remembered that Arabs have just as deep a feeling of having been wronged as do Israelis and their partisans.

Wryly, there is still doubt about what exactly King Faisal said. The New York Times correspondent covering his news conference concluded his dispatch with an observation to the effect that some observers in the capital felt the most significant thing in King Faisal's remarks was his implied backing away from "the objective espoused by some Arab extremists—destruction of Israel."