

August 30, 1966

think this is precisely the term that explains the problem. There has been neglect on the part of the city government, neglect on the part of the North Side merchants, neglect on the part of business generally, on the part of labor, and neglect on my part, too. There has been neglect on the part of everyone.

At this critical moment we do not need any recrimination. What we do need is constructive cooperation that will provide, first, proper and adequate police protection, and I can assure the public that we will provide such protection for property and for the life of every individual citizen.

Second, we must provide an effective attack on the conditions that breed social unrest. We are on our way now but we must not let go. We must provide jobs for our young people and we must provide decent homes for everyone. We must make certain that there are decent recreational programs and meaningful opportunities not only for jobs, but also for training and for counseling.

Let me emphasize a further point. There is no intention on my part or on the part of the police department to condone or excuse or forgive any kind of crime. All violations of the law will be punished. Violators will be apprehended and prosecuted with the full force of the law. But while our police operations proceed, we are going to make certain that where there is distress, where there is unemployment, that we will identify every family and every individual in need and we will make every genuine and sincere effort to help that family or individual. This is our proper responsibility.

I say candidly and directly that there will be police protection, that we will apprehend and prosecute violators with full and due process of the law and we will make a full attack upon social conditions in our city that must be corrected.

I have great pride in Minneapolis as I have said many times. I say again tonight, we have within our power to make the City of Minneapolis the model city of America. We can develop a pattern of human relations in which every individual does have equal opportunity in our economy and in our society. We must recognize our potential and we must be prepared to realize it.

There is much that we can learn from this disturbance. It can give us a new awareness and a new alertness.

To those who have called my office complaining that our policies are rewarding vandalism, I say, truthfully, plainly and directly, that this is not the case. Our policies recognize the fact that conditions that breed social unrest demand our attention.

We cannot afford to have Negroes fighting whites and whites fighting Negroes. We are all part of one large community and there is room for all of us in our strong and productive economy. We must share in the growth and strength of our society. To do this we must have constructive and tolerant outlooks. That is what we are seeking and that is what we must achieve.

"FAMOUS LAST WORDS"

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the tragedy of Vietnam lies in our massive involvement virtually without allies. What began as a little war is now a major conflict. Our involvement in this miserable civil war has continued to grow—more men, more money, and more weapons until today we have almost 500,000 men in Vietnam, Thailand, and with our 7th Fleet off the coast of Vietnam in the Tonkin Gulf and the South China Sea.

For several years we have listened to fatuous predictions painting a rosy but false picture of our position in Vietnam

from Defense Secretary McNamara, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, and other administration officials.

In fact, Mr. President, a compilation of their predictions might well fill a small book which would be appropriately entitled "Famous Last Words." Here are just a few statements by top administration officials and military leaders. Mr. President, the American people may judge for themselves the wisdom and validity of those statements.

Here are some "Famous Last Words":
Admiral Radford, 1953—"The French are going to win."

Admiral Radford, 1954—"The French are winning the war in Vietnam. The forces of General Giap are on the run." (Dienbienphu surrendered May 1954—and France then withdrew its army of 240,000).

White House, 1963—"Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, though there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel. By the end of this year, the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn."

Assist. Defense Secretary Arthur Sylvester, 1963—"The corner definitely has been turned toward victory in South Vietnam; Defense Department officials are hopeful that the 12,000 man United States force there can be reduced in 1 to 3 years."

Defense Secretary McNamara, 1963—"We are winning the war in Vietnam."

General Westmoreland, Commanding in Vietnam, Oct. 1965—"Now I can say at last we have stopped losing the war."

President Johnson, 1964—"We are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys should be doing for themselves."

President Johnson, 1964—"There are those who say I ought to go north and drop bombs to wipe out the supply lines . . . But we don't want to get tied down in a land war in Asia."

Secretary of Defense McNamara, Feb. 1964—"I don't believe that we as a nation should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam." Again May 1964—"This war must be won by the Vietnamese themselves. If they're to win it they just have to have a stable political structure within which to operate. We can provide advice; we can provide logistical support; we can provide training assistance, but we cannot fight the war itself."

Furthermore, Mr. President, the facts are I have written the parents and widows of 166 Ohio soldiers, armen, and marines who have been killed in combat in Vietnam since last January first. Also, more than 990 Ohio GI's have been wounded in the same period.

Certainly, these statements and many other statements I could cite indicate that many administration leaders have consistently underestimated the strength and staying power of the Vietnamese who consider that they are fighting for national liberation. These leaders have time and time again been wrong regarding our involvement in the Vietnam war.

A RESOLUTION OF THANKS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we are all the frequent recipients of resolutions passed by various organizations

on a wide variety of topics, usually urging us to support or to oppose proposed legislation. But it is quite rare in my experience to receive an official resolution not asking for something, but rather thanking Government officials for an action which has been accomplished.

I have recently received such a resolution, passed by the Journeymen Barbers' Local No. 247 in Indianapolis, commending the Senate, House of Representatives, Department of Labor, and the President for the beneficial results of the on-the-job training program in the barbering industry, particularly the "up-grading training" to develop hairstyling competence. Reaction to the OJT program in other fields has also been very good, but it has remained for the Indianapolis group to provide a formal resolution of thanks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas Local Union No. 247 of the Journeymen Barbers International Union meeting in regular meeting on July 14, 1966, at Indianapolis, Indiana,

Whereas the members of the Local have realized the need for up-grading training in order to take advantage of the job opportunities of today in the men's hairstyling field. Through the OJT Program the rate of drop-outs from the barbering industry has been discouraged, while at the same time has created many related job opportunities in the barber-Men's Hairstylist field.

Whereas the Government of the United States of America has made this training possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Local Union wishes to thank the Barbers International Union, the United States Department of Labor, members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and the President of the United States for this training program that was so badly needed. We wish to see it extended for many are yet to receive the training. We pledge ourselves to its support and to utilize every job opportunity related to it as we know it has great future potentials.

EVERETT R. BRUMFIELD,
President.
C. O. HUFF,
Secretary-Treasurer.

[SEAL]

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the riots and civic disturbances in American communities this summer have aroused much interest and comment. An understanding of these disturbances and their possible effect is certainly of great importance, and I believe therefore that a recent article by the Honorable Richard M. Nixon in the August 15, 1966, edition of U.S. News & World Report is timely and pertinent. I ask unanimous consent that the article be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 15, 1966]

IF MOB RULE TAKES HOLD IN UNITED STATES—
A WARNING FROM RICHARD NIXON

(NOTE.—A former Vice President declares here that law and order are breaking down in

Second, it is likely that we can and should learn more than we have from such successful cases as the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction on Taiwan, the locally based rural works program in East Pakistan, and the credit unions and rural cooperatives in Latin America. They can teach us how to help rural communities organize and apply their latent energy to their own problems and thus achieve high rates of growth in agricultural production and rural living standards.

Third, we can do much more to establish direct connections between private organizations and individuals in the advanced countries and the problems they can help to solve in the developing countries—as A.I.D. has done with considerable success in helping to establish savings-and-loan systems in several Latin American countries, primarily by supporting the efforts of leaders in the United States' savings-and-loan industry.

Fourth, we could do more to help establish and support private American Organizations designed for specialized tasks in the developing countries: for example, the American Institute for Free Labor Development, established by the A.F.L.-C.I.O. to work with labor unions in Latin America; or the International Executive Service Corps, established by a group of private business leaders to provide American volunteers to work with individual business firms in developing countries.

These are only illustrations—of which a far longer list could easily be prepared—of ways in which it should be possible to administer assistance in more imaginative and more flexible ways so as to induce and support private and local groups in developing countries to deal with their own problems. This is extremely important because these measures can stimulate not only economic and social progress, but also the development of more democratic societies.

III

My last major point relates to research and evaluation. It is my impression that the organizations which carry out aid programs do not have a distinguished record of building into those programs strong elements of research and evaluation. Certainly this is true of A.I.D., the agency I know best.

This is unfortunate on at least two counts. First, foreign assistance is a relatively new activity and plainly we have an enormous amount to learn about how to conduct it effectively. We have lost much valuable time and have failed to learn from much valuable experience, because we have not had adequate research and evaluation programs. Second, the process of foreign assistance is inherently dependent on research. It is often described as a method of transferring know-how, but this is plainly wrong; it is instead a process of developing know-how—a process of finding out what will work in Nigeria, not of transferring what has been found to work in Nebraska. If we understood our own business better, it might well be that the whole process of foreign aid would be seen as a research process, aimed at learning how to move a particular society, with its special and unique characteristics of history and culture and physical geography, toward specified objectives.

However that may be, there can be no doubt of the importance of incorporating far stronger programs of research and evaluation into our aid administration. We in the Agency for International Development have been trying to make some headway in this direction. For example: (a) For the last three years, we have organized special summer research projects on the economic aspects of development, drawing together faculty members and graduate students from a number of universities for a summer of research work that benefits them and greatly benefits us; (b) Over the last four years, we have gradually built up a program of research

grants, financing such varied activities as trying to increase production of high-protein grain legumes in Asia, and developing a new mathematics curriculum for elementary schools in Africa. In this we have had the guidance of a distinguished advisory committee of research scientists chaired by Dr. Walsh McDermott of Cornell University; (c) A year ago we persuaded Colonel George Lincoln, of the West Point social science faculty, to spend his sabbatical examining A.I.D.'s systems of evaluation, and recommending improvements in them. Colonel Lincoln's report, based on extensive field work in Latin America, is a valuable guide that is now being applied throughout the Agency.

In these ways and others, A.I.D. is taking steps to improve its own performance. We still have far to go, particularly in finding how we can build into every aspect of our work the spirit of research on development problems. We also have done far too little in a systematic way to help create research competence in the developing countries themselves.

Whatever part of the aid business one examines, wherever one looks in the developing countries, one sees large and challenging opportunities for improving the administration of aid so as to achieve more rapid economic, social and political progress. Our mood should be restless, inquiring, impatient—for there is much to be done.

RACIAL VIOLENCE—STATEMENT BY THE MAYOR OF MINNEAPOLIS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, America's great cities are, as every Member of this body knows, plagued by many problems, not the least of which are outbreaks of racial violence. These outbreaks cause substantial disruption in human relations, and in many cases worsen the physical condition under which people in congested urban areas must live. It is clear that new lines of communication between people in our cities are as vital to their renewal as expanded freeways and modern buildings. I am pleased to be able, as a Senator from Minnesota, to bring to the attention of the U.S. Senate the statement of the Honorable Arthur Naftalin, mayor of the city of Minneapolis, in regard to the recent riots on the North Side of Minneapolis. I am proud of the manner in which this outbreak of violence was handled, and I ask unanimous consent that it be brought to the attention of the U.S. Senate.

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

STATEMENT OF MAYOR ARTHUR NAFTALIN, MAYOR'S REPORT, WWTC RADIO, AUGUST 7, 1966

I welcome this opportunity to discuss last week's disturbance on the North Side. I am eager to clarify certain points and to review the policies we have been following.

I should like to begin by noting that the events of the week have had two quite different reactions from the community.

One response has been that of concern and constructive cooperation. The police department, our settlement houses, our leading business firms, our social welfare agencies have all given truly magnificent support to programs that were quickly undertaken.

Unfortunately, there has been a second reaction that is most disturbing. Many individuals have called or written—in a few cases they have sent telegrams—to express opposition to a program aimed at providing job opportunities for young men and women

and boys and girls who have been without jobs for a long period of time.

Many of these expressions have been threatening and unusually personal. It comes as a shock to discover that there are many people who do not understand the need for different programs to meet different types of situations. They represent a blind refusal to examine objectively the causes of the problems before us.

Thus, at one level our community is strong and responsive. It is prepared to face responsibly and humanely the serious questions raised by the disturbance. At another level there is a critical need to awaken the public to social conditions that desperately need attention.

When the disturbance occurred, followed by reports of possible increased violence, we had two choices before us. We could intensify police action, calling in men from other sections of the city, and, in effect, converting the area into an armed camp. Or we could recognize that underlying the disturbance are deep-seated conditions that demand prompt and effective attention.

Several days before the disturbance occurred I spent a full day on the North Side visiting with various groups. I stated at that time that I was greatly concerned about joblessness among North Side young people. Later, after the disturbance had occurred and in meeting with Governor Rolvaag and with a large number of community leaders, this fact was confirmed by group after group of responsible citizens.

We arrived at a strong consensus that what was needed was not vigorous and overwhelming action on the part of the police department but rather prompt and effective and sincere efforts to deal with the causes of the unrest, and this is what we resolved to do.

We decided to begin with the problem of unemployment. We appealed to leading business firms. We said to them, "Please look at these young men and women and let's develop immediately opportunities for them."

This program is under way and now we must turn to housing and we must look at parks and recreation and we must look at the management of police problems involving members of minority groups.

At this point I should emphasize the fact that the decisions we made—for example the decision to maintain as normal police operation as possible—were arrived at co-operatively and with the full participation of the police department itself. I want to stress this fact, which I think is very important, that, in this process of continuous discussion, we have achieved a most unusual degree of communication—communication between the police department and the non-white community, communication between and among many lawyers of white and Negro leadership. I believe we have for the first time reached in depth many, many people in the Negro community whom we have not previously been in contact with.

I must state this point very clearly: The individuals who want trouble in the community are so few they can be counted on two hands, but these few people will exploit the despair, the restlessness, the feeling of helplessness on the part of other Negroes, seizing leadership from people within the community who sincerely want to develop decent standards of living for all of the people, black and white.

What we have been able to do, as a result of our intensive activity during this week, is to establish excellent communication and to develop the beginnings of a bulwark against irresponsible and destructive leadership. It is making it possible to take constructive steps that are long overdue in developing critically needed programs.

Thursday night I met with North Side businessmen. One of the men made a brief statement to the effect that the problem on the North Side is the product of neglect. I

August 30, 1966

AN INVITATION TO VISIT ALABAMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as a part of "seeing America first," I would like to renew my invitation to my colleagues of the Senate and all the people of our Nation to stop by and see us in Alabama.

Alabama's natural wonders, such as its cool lakes in the Tennessee River system, its lengthy waterways, its warm gulf coast, have always attracted much attention and many visitors.

Today, however, I would like to draw your attention to a treasure that lies beneath the surface of our State—the variety of caves and caverns that have brought spelunkers and archeologists to explore their wonders.

Perhaps best known is Russell Cave, near Bridgeport. Here in the mountains above the Tennessee River is the oldest known habitation in the southeastern United States, with a record of occupancy that goes back more than 8,000 years.

The National Park Service has developed the cave area, and there is a museum at the visitors center where the tools and other artifacts of these fore-runners of Alabamians can be seen and studied.

Valuable archeological finds have been made here in the excavations of the National Geographic Society and Smithsonian Institution, which began about 10 years ago. These indicate connections with inhabitants of other parts of the continent, and tell the story of the successive generations who lived in this great cave.

Cathedral Caverns at Grant contain the "Goliath," believed to be the world's mightiest stalagmite. It is 60 feet tall and 200 feet in girth.

Of great natural beauty are other, not so widely publicized caves. Among these is Kymulga Onyx Cave, located on Alabama Highway 76, 5 miles east of Childersburg. Featured are thousands of onyx formations, stalactites and stalagmites. Also on display is a collection of Indian relics, old maps, and other historic documents.

Not far from Birmingham are the Crystal Caverns and Rickwood Caverns. An amazing feature of Crystal Caverns at Clay is a perfect formation of the Capitol dome. A petrified waterfall is another. There are also camping facilities for visitors. Rickwood Caverns at Warrior have an abundance of glittering stalagmites.

Sequoyah Cave, at Valley Head, has been called a must for spelunkers. This newly opened cave contains lacy formations with colorful shadings, a whispering waterfall and a mirror lake.

At Fort Payne is Manitou Cave and its haystack, one of those fascinating formations which reflect themselves in the glassy stream flowing through this huge, well-lighted cave.

And at the Guntersville Caverns there is an enchanting underground world of colorful formations and sea fossils. Always remembered are the "Whosababies," formations resembling little people.

So I would like to remind you again that there's more to see in Alabama than on the surface. Come visit us and find out.

OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Observer newspapers of Michigan have recently instituted a new feature entitled "Ombudsman." This is similar to the "Action Line" column of the Washington Evening Star. According to the Observer newspapers:

We will do our best to be a go-between, a red-tape cutter as the name indicates. When you have exhausted all other measures on a problem write to us, and we'll see if we can help. Yes, John Q, you can fight city hall—with your own Ombudsman!

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the text of this interesting column from the July 21, 1966, issue of the Plymouth, Mich., Observer.

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

[From the Plymouth (Mich.) Observer,
July 21, 1966]

OMBUDSMAN

(NOTE.—A new feature in The Observer Newspapers—we will do our best to be a go-between, a red-tape cutter as the name indicates. When you have exhausted all other measures on a problem write to us (keep it short, please) and we'll see if we can help. Yes, John Q, you can fight city hall—with your own Ombudsman!)

DEAR OMBUDSMAN: Please help us! How can we get the County to post signs keeping these semis off Merriman Road?

They have Farmington and Middlebelt Roads to use—both of which are zoned commercial. We on Merriman Road are very much still a residential area, with small children to worry about.

If they won't keep these semis off, they should rezone us commercial and/or industrial, then (and only then) could we afford to move to a safer place to raise our families.

Also, now that our City Council has approved equipping two Livonia scout cars with radar to catch our speeders; how long will it be before the cars are equipped and officers trained to operate them? We are desperate. (If you don't believe how bad it is, just park near our corner, near Six Mile, and hear the noise when the semis pass, and the speed they travel. Our houses rattle and shake.) Also, the speed violators are running rampant from Eight Mile down. It's not safe for any of us to even turn into our driveways.

Mr. and Mrs. R. A. CARPENTER.

LIVONIA.

DEAR CARPENTERS: Sorry, Merriman Road is a class A road and everything on wheels can travel the route.

Bids are in on the radar equipment for the two Livonia Scout cars. As soon as they are awarded by City Council they will be purchased and installed. Should be about one month from now. Policemen can be trained in the use of radar equipment in about an hour. Ombudsman observed three semis breaking the speed laws for the area mentioned in 45 minutes time and alerted Livonia's finest (police) to the speedtrack.

DEAR OMBUDSMAN: As one of the Livonia nonteaching staff, I would like to know how the figures of 225 for and eight against votes were arrived at in the ratification vote for the three year contract that was ratified the 15th of June.

According to the members attending the

ratification meeting, the union representative who took the count only counted to 40 of the standees on the yes vote and only counted to eight on the standees for the 'no' votes.

Everyone who attended this meeting knows there was a roll call passed around and signed by everyone. Some of these members did not vote either way and some of them left before the vote was taken. We also understand there were only 233 members present at that meeting. Please, how do you arrive at these figures?

Why is there never a secret ballot at these meetings? Quite a number of us know the reasons for these actions but would like to be informed officially.

Sincerely,

AN INTERESTED PARTY.

DEAR INTERESTED PARTY: According to Al Ruckstahl, president of the non-teaching staff Local 118 in Livonia School District, no secret ballot is necessary for ratification voting, only for elections of officers. He quoted the Taft-Hartley act that says he is only required to count the 'no' votes; and there can be no such action as 'abstaining'. All such votes are automatically counted 'yea.' His source of information is Council No. 23.

SCHOOL MILK EXTENSION SHOULD BE TAKEN UP ON HOUSE FLOOR THIS WEEK

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I was gratified to note late last week that the House Rules Committee granted an open rule with 2 hours of debate on H.R. 13361, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. A key provision of this legislation extends the special milk program for school children through fiscal 1970 and increases the program's level of funding.

This legislation had been snarled in a jurisdictional dispute between the House Education and Labor Committee and the House Agriculture Committee. I am delighted that the Rules Committee was able to resolve this dispute and get the bill to the floor of the House.

All indications are that the legislation will be taken up by the full House either this week or soon after the Labor Day weekend. However the bill language will then probably be substituted for the language of the Senate child nutrition bill, S. 3467, and the House passed version of S. 3467 taken to a conference between the two Houses. This means that no final action will be taken on the legislation until after the Nation's schoolchildren return to their classes this fall.

Mr. President, I hope that both the House and the conferees will act with dispatch so that the local and State administrators who manage the school milk program can plan ahead for the 1967 school year. Congress, by reiterating its faith in the school milk program, will make the task of the school food service administrators much simpler. They can act with the certainty that the program will continue to advance and prosper next year as well as this year.

RAPID AMERICAN MILITARY BUILD- UP IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the last few days we have seen a rash of press reports—of almost epidemic character—describing the rapid American military buildup in Thailand. I gather

the United States, and adds this warning: "From mob rule it is but a single step to lynch law and the termination of the rights of the minority."

(Richard M. Nixon criticizes ROBERT KENNEDY, HUBERT HUMPHREY, other top Americans for statements that nurture "seeds of civil anarchy.")

(This article was prepared by Mr. Nixon for "U.S. News & World Report.")

(By Richard M. Nixon)

The polls still place the war in Vietnam and the rising cost of living as the major political issues of 1966. But, from my own trips across the nation, I can affirm that private conversations and public concern are increasingly focusing upon the issues of disrespect for law and race turmoil.

The recent riots in Chicago, Cleveland, New York and Omaha have produced in the public dialogue too much heat and very little light. The extremists have held the floor for too long.

One extreme sees a simply remedy for rioting in a ruthless application of the truncheon and an earlier call to the National Guard.

The other extremists are more articulate, but their position is equally simplistic. To them, riots are to be excused upon the grounds that the participants have legitimate social grievances or seek justifiable social goals.

I believe it would be a grave mistake to charge off the recent riots to unredressed Negro grievances alone.

To do so is to ignore a prime reason and a major national problem: the deterioration of respect for the rule of law all across America.

That deterioration can be traced directly to the spread of the corrosive doctrine that every citizen possesses an inherent right to decide for himself which laws to disobey and when to disobey them.

The doctrine has become a contagious national disease, and its symptoms are manifest in more than just racial violence. We see them in the contempt among many of the young for the agents of the law—the police. We see them in the public burning of draft cards and the blocking of troop trains.

We saw those symptoms when citizens in Chicago took to the streets to block public commerce to force the firing of a city official. We saw them on a campus of the University of California, where students brought a great university to its knees in protest of the policies of its administration.

Who is responsible for the breakdown of law and order in this country? I think it both an injustice and an oversimplification to lay the blame at the feet of the sidewalk demagogues alone.

For such a deterioration of respect for law to occur in so brief a time in so great a nation, we must look for more important collaborators and auxiliaries.

It is my belief that the seeds of civil anarchy would never have taken root in this nation had they not been nurtured by scores of respected Americans: public officials, educators, clergymen and civil-rights leaders as well.

When the junior Senator from New York publicly declares that "there is no point in telling Negroes to obey the law," because to the Negro "the law is the enemy," then he has provided a rationale and justification for every Negro intent upon taking the law into his own hands.

When the Vice President of the United States publicly declares that if he lived in the conditions of the slums he would "lead a mighty good revolt," then he is giving aid and comfort to those who revolt violently in Chicago and New York.

The agonies and indignities of urban slums are hard facts of life. Their elimination is properly among our highest national prior-

ities. But within those slums, political phrases which are inflammatory are as wrong and dangerous as political promises which are irredeemable.

In this contest, men of intellectual and moral eminence who encourage public disobedience of the law are responsible for the acts of those who inevitably follow their counsel: the poor, the ignorant and the impressionable.

Such leaders are most often men of good will who do not condone violence and, perhaps even now, see no relation between the civil disobedience which they counsel and the riots and violence which have erupted. Yet, once the decision is made that laws need not be obeyed—whatever the rationale—a contribution is made to a climate of lawlessness.

To the professor objecting to *de facto* segregation, it may be crystal clear where civil disobedience may begin and where it must end. But the boundaries have become fluid to his students. And today they are all but invisible in the urban slums.

In this nation we raise our young to respect the law and public authority. What becomes of those lessons when teachers and leaders of the young themselves deliberately and publicly violate the laws?

As Chaucer put it, "If gold rust, what shall iron do?"

There is a crucial difference between lawful demonstrations and protests on the one hand—and illegal demonstrations and "civil disobedience" on the other.

I think it is time the doctrine of civil disobedience was analyzed and rejected as not only wrong but potentially disastrous.

RULE OF MOB VERSUS RULE OF LAW

If all have a right to engage in public disobedience to protest real or imagined wrongs, then the example set by the minority today will be followed by the majority tomorrow.

Issues then will no longer be decided upon merit by an impartial judge. Victory will go to the side which can muster the greater number of demonstrators in the streets. The rule of law will be replaced by the rule of the mob. And one may be sure that the majority's mob will prevail.

From mob rule it is but a single step to lynch law and the termination of the rights of the minority. This is why it is so paradoxical today to see minority groups engaging in civil disobedience; their greatest defense is the rule of law.

Throughout history men concerned over the right of an unpopular minority have painstakingly sought to establish the rule of law.

The American Fathers who wrote the Constitution insisted that the rights designed to protect minority protest—speech, the press and assembly—be written down in a Bill of Rights.

They did not believe that the rights of a minority could be maintained for any time against a predatory majority without the sanction of law. As Jefferson stated, "In questions of power, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

The results of a decline in respect for the law are predictable. Prof. Sidney Hook, an eloquent advocate of human rights, has clearly foreseen one of them. He has warned that those who object to social progress and oppose equal rights for every citizen may themselves "adopt the strategies and techniques of the civil-disobedience movement."

Civil disobedience creates a climate of disrespect for law. In such a climate the first laws to be ignored will be social legislation that lacks universal public support. In short, if the rule of law goes, the civil-rights laws of recent vintage will be the first casualties.

Historic advances in civil rights have come through court decisions and federal laws in the last dozen years.

Only the acceptance of those laws and the voluntary compliance of the people can transfer those advances from the statute books into the fabric of community life.

If indifference to the rule of law permeates the community, there will be no voluntary acceptance. A law is only as good as the will of the people to obey it.

Not all the police in the nation could enforce the public-accommodations section of the 1964 Civil Rights Act if there were not a commitment on the part of the people to accept it as law. If Negroes must repeatedly haul restaurateurs into court before they can be served a meal, then the guarantee of equal accommodations is illusory.

"DISORDERS ARE BUILDING WALL OF HATE"

Across this nation today, civil disobedience and racial disorders are building up a wall of hate between the races, which, while less visible, is no less real than the wall that divides freedom and slavery in the city of Berlin.

Newton's law of action and reaction has application to the social as well as the physical world.

Continued racial violence and disorders in the cities of the nation will produce growing disenchantment with the cause of civil rights—even among its staunchest supporters.

It will encourage a disregard for civil-rights laws and resistance to the legitimate demands of the Negro people.

Does anyone think that progress will be made in the hearts of men by riots and disobedience which trample upon the rights of those same men? But then it is not enough to simply demand that all laws be obeyed.

Edmund Burke once wrote concerning loyalty to a nation that "to make us love our country, our country ought to be lovely." There is an analogy in a commitment to the rule of law. For a law to be respected, it ought to be worthy of respect. It must be fair and it must be fairly enforced.

It certainly did nothing to prevent a riot when Negroes in Chicago learned that while water hydrants in their own area were being shut down, they were running freely in white neighborhoods just blocks away.

Respect for the dignity of every individual is absolutely essential if there is to be respect for law.

The most common and justifiable complaint of Negroes and members of other minority groups is not that their constitutional rights have been denied, but that their personal dignity is repeatedly insulted.

As an American citizen, the American Negro is entitled to equality of rights, under the Constitution and the law, with every other citizen in the land. But, as important as this, the Negro has the right to be treated with the basic dignity and respect that belong to him as a human being.

Advocates of civil disobedience contend that a man's conscience should determine which law is to be obeyed and when a law can be ignored. But, to many men, conscience is no more than the enshrinement of their own prejudices.

In the gray areas of social and economic legislation, there are hundreds of laws. Honest men can and do disagree on the wisdom and justice of these laws.

But if every man is to decide for himself which to obey and which to ignore, the end result is anarchy.

The way to make good laws is not to break bad laws, but to change bad laws through legitimate means of protest within the ambit of constitutional process.

In the last analysis, the nation simply can no longer tolerate men who are above the law. For, as Lincoln said, "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law."

from these articles that about 25,000 Americans servicemen are now in that country, more American soldiers than were in Vietnam on January 1, 1965, and according to one article, this number will increase to 32,000 by the end of the year. We are told that more than 1,500 bombing and reconnaissance missions are made each week from these bases in Thailand into North Vietnam and the Communist-controlled corridor in Laos. No precise cost figures are given in these articles, but one of these bases alone will reportedly cost of \$500 million alone. One reporter's judgment that "Thailand is now the site of a multibillion-dollar U.S. buildup" certainly would seem to be reasonable, although a high State Department official told the committee in open session on August 23 that he felt that this estimate was high.

The press reports which appeared earlier this week and last week noted the unclear legal situation regarding these bases. One reporter wrote that "juridically, there are no foreign bases in Thailand because no specific agreement for their establishment was ever signed with the United States." The airbases in Thailand from which American planes fly more than half the U.S. bombing attacks against North Vietnam were built and are used almost exclusively by the United States. Yet, the bases are juridically Thai Air Force bases, and the Thai Government does not admit that they are, in fact, American bases used by American planes for missions in Vietnam. Perhaps the bases rest on shaky political, as well as legal, foundations.

Other than the fact that Thailand is close to Laos and North Vietnam, another factor has affected our interest in this southeast Asian country—that is, the Communist insurgent movements in the northeast and the south. These counterinsurgent movements, according to the press reports I have read, feed partly on the fact that the Thai Government is hardly a parliamentary democracy. There have been no national elections since 1957, when Parliament was dissolved. There is a constituent assembly, whose members have been appointed, not elected. It has been drafting a Constitution, but, in the words of one reporter, the end of this task is not in sight.

The Thai Government has apparently responded to the Communist insurgents in a rather inept fashion. One article quoted an American adviser as saying:

The Communists are trapping the Government into making mistakes that work in their favor.

The same article commented that "the people tend to fear the Government more than they do the Communists," the nature of the Thai Government "makes it more important for a Provincial Governor to please Bangkok than to satisfy his own population," and the question of "how much ground can be held against the Communists may require a change away from the conservative, paternalistic outlook of the Bangkok military oligarchy."

These are ominous remarks which inevitably raise important questions. What is the precise nature of our "commitment" to Thailand? On what legal

basis are we there? Are we identifying ourselves too closely with an unpopular and unrepresentative military regime? Will a massive foreign military presence in Thailand engender hostility among a people who have never been colonized? Will Thailand's involvement in the war in Vietnam shorten the war or enlarge it?

These questions have been raised either explicitly or implicitly by American journalists. I believe we have a responsibility to raise them here and to have the administration's replies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "U.S. Power Machinery Turns Thailand Into a Bristling Bastion of the East," written by Stanley Karnow, and published in the August 19 Washington Post; an article entitled "Ineptness Frustrates Thai Efforts To Counter Red Drive in Province," written by Stanley Karnow and published in the August 22 Washington Post; an article entitled "Inscrutable Thailand Appears Stable," published in the August 23 Washington Post; an article entitled "A Silent Partner for the United States in Asia," published in the New York Times of August 21; an article entitled "Thailand Hinterland Worried by Reds," written by Peter Braestrup, published in the New York Times of August 22; an article entitled "Apathy on Coming Vote Found in South Vietnam," written by R. W. Apple, Jr., and published in the New York Times of August 15, 1966; and an article entitled "Saigon Hears Constitution Will Be Delayed," written by Ward Just, and published in the Washington Post of August 20, 1966.

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

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 19, 1966]
**U.S. POWER MACHINERY TURNS THAILAND INTO
 A BRISTLING BASTION OF THE EAST**
 (By Stanley Karnow, Washington Post
 foreign service)

BANGKOK.—The burly American engineer squinted in the tropical sunlight as he scanned the construction site at Nam Phong on the plains of central Thailand nearly 400 miles northeast of here.

Like huge mechanical insects, bulldozers, graders, tractors and trucks were moving earth for a new United States airbase whose first runway, more than 11,000 feet long, will be in operation next February.

"That runway is only the beginning of this job," the engineer explained. "There'll be other runways, roads, fuel depots, hangars and the lot. We're expanding so fast that we don't know today what new project they'll throw at us tomorrow."

Indeed, except for secretive contingency planners in the Pentagon, nobody quite knows where the current U.S. military expansion in Thailand is headed.

How far it goes, some American officials here suggest, will depend on the course of events in Vietnam and elsewhere in Asia. Others submit that this multi-billion-dollar U.S. base-building scheme could significantly shape those events, perhaps into a wider conflict.

Whatever the future holds, the United States with crash-program rapidity and a minimum of fanfare, has already turned this Southeast Asian kingdom into a bristling bastion, altering the dimensions of military power in the Far East.

From the Thai bases of Takhlil, Udorn,

Ubon, and Korat, U.S. Air Force RF-101s, F-105s and F-4Cs fly more than 1,500 bombing and reconnaissance missions each week against North Vietnam and the Communist-controlled Laos corridor.

At present, there are more than 200 of these aircraft in Thailand, grouped into 12 squadrons. Four other squadrons are expected to arrive before the end of the year. Accordingly, the number of U.S. servicemen in the country, 65 percent of them Air Force personnel, will increase to more than 32,000—almost three times as many as were stationed here last January.

In addition, the United States is accelerating a variety of other operations inside Thailand, or using the country for covert activities nearby.

From an airstrip at Nakorn Phanom, on the Mekong River bordering Laos, U.S. helicopters swing out on risky flights to rescue American pilots shot down over North Vietnam. In Lopburi Province, 100 miles, north of Bangkok, and near the Mekong River town of Mukdahan, green-bereted U.S. Special Forces instructors are setting up camps to train Thai guerrillas, possibly for harassment of the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos.

At the same time, U.S. military men are increasingly becoming involved in civic action efforts to counter a smoldering Communist insurgency in northeastern Thailand. Teams of American Army medics have been roaming rural regions, treating peasants for everything from pregnancy to dysentery. Equipped with 15 helicopters, U.S. "Air Commandos" based at Nakorn Phanom are launching a program to distribute medicine to remote areas.

Against the possibility that American ground troops might be needed in Thailand, the U.S. Army's Ninth Logistical Command has stockpiled its warehouses at Korat with enough vehicles, weapons and ammunition to equip a 17,000-man infantry division.

Meanwhile U.S. military engineers and civilian technicians of the Philco Corp. are stringing Thailand together in a network of radio communications and radar screens. Academic experts on U.S. Government contracts are covering the country assessing social conditions, and Central Intelligence Agency operatives are training hill tribesmen long neglected by the Bangkok authorities.

But the biggest and most dramatic part of the U.S. military buildup in Thailand are two giant bases yet to go into full operations. They are Nam Phong, scheduled for final completion in three years, and the enormous air-sea complex at Sattahip on the Gulf of Siam, whose first runway was inaugurated last week.

BASES TO BE LINKED

About 500 miles apart, these bases will be linked to each other and to other U.S. airfields by highways and pipelines now under construction. Both will have KC-135 tanker aircraft, which refuel the jets that strike at North Vietnam and Laos. Both will be capable of handling B-52 bombers, which now fly 5,000-mile round trips from Guam to fulfill their missions over South Vietnam.

With its 11,500 foot runway already open, the Sattahip base—whose airfield is officially called U-Tapao—will soon receive 30 KC-135 tankers as well as units of troop carrier and cargo aircraft.

When its second, 10,500-foot runway is finished, U-Tapao will also have the capacity for three squadrons of fighter-bombers.

Being built by the American firms of Dillingham, Zachry and Kaiser at a cost of more than \$500 million, the whole U-Tapao setup will be the largest complex of its kind in Southeast Asia. It may well become, after Bangkok, the second largest city in Thailand. According to current estimates, its maintenance should require at least 15,000 Americans.

When completed, the Sattahip naval station, six miles from the airfield, will have,

August 30, 1966

rock breakwaters, deep-water piers and 70 bunkers for storing ammunition. It will also be connected to a neighboring oil refinery.

Inaugurating the runway last week, U.S. Ambassador Graham Martin said that "this field could be made fully operational within a matter of weeks, or even within a matter of days, depending upon the urgency of need."

At the same ceremony, Thai Premier Thanom Kittikaehorn stated that the Thais had cooperated with the United States in constructing the base "because we realize that our intentions are the same."

In a curious way, however, the sensitive Thai, the only Southeast Asians to avoid colonial domination, are extremely reluctant to give public recognition to the enlarging U.S. presence in their country.

Though built by Americans to U.S. specifications—and with American funds—the airbases are technically Thai. They fly Thai flags and are guarded by Thai soldiers. The U.S. Air Force must advise the Thai government of each mission flown from the fields.

Nor is formal mention ever made of the fact that more than half the U.S. bombing attacks against North Vietnam originate at Thai bases. As one Thai official put it: "Hanoi doesn't admit to sending troops into South Vietnam, so why should we concede to the role we play in the Vietnam war?"

NO SPECIFIC AGREEMENT

Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman likes to point out that, juridically, there are no foreign bases in Thailand because no specific agreement for their establishment was ever signed with the United States. "We are partners in collective defense," he has explained.

The basis of this collective defense is the Southeast Asia treaty of 1954, signed by eight nations, including the United States and Thailand. The treaty was reinforced in May, 1962, by a U.S. pledge to defend Thailand against Communism.

Despite these documents it was no easy matter for the United States to persuade the Thai to agree to the bases. Ambassador Martin's success in winning accord for the fields, in the words of one American official here, was "nothing short of a diplomatic miracle."

Even so, the Thai like to display their independence from time to time. Early this year, for example, they stalled on a U.S. request for permission to put more aircraft into the country.

Pointing to the Thais' refusal to publicize the bases, some Americans familiar with the country stress that Thailand has retained its sovereignty through history because of its ability to accommodate itself to shifting power balances. During World War II, for example, the Thais sided with Japan, then leaned to the West when an Allied victory approached.

SOME DOUBTS CAST

Past performances of that sort, therefore, have cast doubts on Thailand's reliability as the keystone of an American defense system in Southeast Asia.

But it has been argued, in contrast, that the Thais have even more reason to question the reliability of the United States. In particular, the Thais are chronically concerned that a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam war would give the Communists an edge.

For that reason, perhaps, they are anxious to keep their options by maintaining the legal fiction that they are not harboring American bases. Understanding this outlook, a local editor here said: "The Americans can always go home, but we have to live very close to Communist China."

At the moment, however, there is no sign that the Americans are going home. On the contrary, the bases are building up, and the bars and night clubs are proliferating. Bangkok already has nearly 130 brothels disguised as "massage parlors," and Udorn features such spots as the "Friendship Club," where the girls do a topless twist.

In areas near the bases, old traditions are crumbling and business is booming—or as a Korat hotel owner put it: "The Americans are good for our economy but bad for our culture."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 22, 1966]

INEPTNESS FRUSTRATED THAI EFFORTS TO COUNTER RED DRIVE IN PROVINCE

(By Stanley Karnow, Washington Post foreign service)

NAKORAN PHANOM, THAILAND.—Seated at a makeshift bamboo table in his jungle headquarters near this Northeast province town, the Thai Army major admitted his bewilderment.

He commands an array of troops and police deployed to uproot the bands of Communist insurgents and their sympathizers scattered through this hinterland of rice fields, teak forest and remote villages.

"But our trouble," the major said, "is that we don't know who is Communist and who is not."

That complaint is familiar to any Vietnam veteran. And in several ways, this smoldering Communist insurrection seems a repetition of the Vietnam war at its outset six or seven years ago. As they did in Vietnam at that time, the Communists here are currently killing officials, organizing cadres and promising prosperity to peasants.

Yet the most significant similarity between the two situations may lie less in the Communist challenge than in the Thai government's often awkward response.

BANGKOK ENTRAPPED

Indeed, there are seasoned American advisors here who submit that present Communist tactics are mainly a snare. As one of them put it, "The Communists are trapping the government into making mistakes that work in their favor."

Some of the government errors are so blatant as to be incredible in this era of counter-insurgency publicity. Like the Thai Army major who cannot identify a real Communist, military and police officers throughout this region regularly round up villagers, considering them suspect unless their innocence can be proved.

Near Nakae, a critical sector about 25 miles from here, peasants may not leave their villages without a special permit that frequently takes hours, bribes or both to obtain. In the area of Mukdahan, on the Mekong River south of here, they are prohibited from carrying food to their fields lest they nourish the Communists. As a result, many must trudge home long distances for lunch.

From all accounts, the most egregious blunders are committed by the provincial police. Operating on low wages and no expense money, they range through villages squeezing the local populace for food, lodging and girls. Uncooperative peasants may have a bone broken—or worse, find themselves detained as Communists.

PLANTING DISRUPTED

A few months ago, during the tricky rice transplanting period, a police unit barged into a village near here, ordered the peasants in from the fields and forced them to build a stockade. The peasants had no choice but to abandon their paddies.

"With this kind of nonsense," explains an American who has spent years here, "people tend to fear the government more than they do the Communists. Of course, the Communists kill officials and informers, but they are selective. The cops are indiscriminate, and so they scare everybody."

More widespread, though subtle, are government short-comings that seem to arise from the inability of officials to understand and sympathize with ordinary citizens.

Ironically, the gap between the Establishment and the people has persisted despite well intentioned government efforts at economic and social development in this region.

Under rural programs being accelerated to meet the growing insurgency, the U.S. and Thai governments have currently committed some \$20 million to an assortment of projects for this Northeast area.

RURAL TEAMS HELP

Engineering teams are constructing irrigation networks, wells, roads and schoolhouses. Medical teams composed of Thai doctors and American Army corpsmen roam the countryside, dispensing medicines and treating the sick. There are Peace Corps volunteers breeding chickens and nurturing silkworms, and instructors holding seminars for villagers on such elementary subjects as how to erect fences and collect garbage.

But the key to all this activity, experts point out, is less what is being done than how it is done. The development schemes, they argue, can be politically fruitless if they fail to bring citizens closer to their government. In this region at least there is still a good deal of distance between officials and the people.

Part of the problem stems from the highly-centralized nature of the Thai government, which makes it more important for a provincial governor to please Bangkok than to satisfy his own population. Also, Thailand is a military dictatorship in which officials need not worry about constituents' votes.

At the same time, this society rests on the ancient tradition, prevalent elsewhere in Asia as well, that the authorities command and the people obey. The despotism may be benign, as it largely is here. Even so, it is still a despotism in which decisions are imposed from the top.

PEASANTS IGNORED

Consequently, specialists here say, the projects being built in this region are based more often on official fiat than on villagers' needs, agreement or comprehension. In several villages near here, for example, peasants have had their meager parcels of land confiscated without due compensation. In some cases, community development workers have seen their recommendations blocked by superiors unreceptive to ideas from underlings.

But for many Thais and their American advisers, the focus on the Northeast is in itself a remarkable bit of progress. It is a sector, neglected for years, that was surely headed into dissidence.

Far from the capital, the Northeast served as a Siberia for unwanted officials. Moreover, it is principally populated by an in-between people who are ethnically Laotian and politically Thai, and are not fully accepted by either nationality. As a Buddhist monk here explained it: "In Laos we're considered Thai, and in Bangkok we're considered Laotian".

The regions biggest handicap, however, has been economic. Lacking adequate water and fertile soil, its rice yields are about 40 per cent below the national average. Its per capita income, only \$45 per year, is less than half that of the rest of the country, and it is inequitably distributed. According to recent study, the upper 2 per cent of the Northeast peasants receive ten times more cash income than the lowest 78 per cent.

Perhaps nothing dramatizes the area's poverty so much as its road. On a map, the highway from Udorn through Sakorn Nakorn here to Nakorn Phanom is a bright red ribbon. In fact it is a potholed, corrugated dirt strip that, these rainy afternoons, turns to mire.

RADICALS FROM HERE

Thai political figures from here were mostly of a radical bent. Many of them supported Pridi Phanomyong the liberal former Premier who now lives in Communist China. The Northeast was also the center of resistance against the Japanese, with whom the Bangkok government allied during World War II.

When military dictators assumed power in Bangkok after the war, they systematic-

August 30, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20281

ally cracked down on Northeast politicians, charging them with advocating separatism, communism or both.

The massive military sweeps through here in the early 1960s instilled in the local population a fear of the Bangkok regime that still remains. The arrests and summary execution of several local leaders, many of them popular in the region, may have given the present insurgents a measure of backing in their opposition to the government.

The more generous attention now being accorded the Northeast by the government has prompted some commentators to remark that the insurrection has been a "blessing in disguise."

But how much ground here can be held against the Communists could depend on more than money and materiel. It may require a change away from the conservative, paternalistic outlook of the Bangkok military oligarchy.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 23, 1966]

INSCRUTABLE THAILAND APPEARS STABLE

BANGKOK.—"I wish they would stop their damn smiling," snapped an American lady who has lived here for several years. And her impetuous remark reflects an attitude toward the Thais shared by many foreigners familiar with this country.

For this land of the Siamese cat, these foreigners contend, is peopled by a nation of Cheshire cats whose perennial grins conceal an elusive, almost evanescent character. Indeed, it is argued, the Thais owe their centuries of independence to their charming, good-humored ambiguity.

A center of American defenses in the Far East since the Eisenhower Administration, Thailand is now the site of a multi-billion-dollar U.S. military buildup focused on giant air and naval bases. But if there is little substance behind the Thai smile, as some critics submit, the United States could be constructing a major anti-Communist bastion on shaky pillars.

Yet in contrast to other states in balkanized Southeast Asia, Thailand has a surface appearance of remarkable stability.

NATIONAL IDENTITY

Except for a Moslem minority in their southernmost provinces and Northerners of Laotian leanings, the Thais feel a relatively high degree of national identity.

Moreover, King Bhumipol Adulyadej, 38, and his beautiful queen, Sirikit, the country's leading pin-up, are authentic symbols of unity, event in areas that feel remote and forgotten by the Bangkok government.

That unity is reinforced, too, by a widespread, active devotion to Theravadic Buddhism. Just as youths in other countries do military service, nearly all young Thais, royalty included, shave their heads, don saffron robes, and spend periods of contemplation in Buddhist temples.

As a further indication of attachment to their native land, almost every Thai who studies abroad returns home. And with no "brain drain," the administration is staffed with dozens of Harvard, Columbia and Oxford graduates.

ECONOMY GROWING

At the same time, Thailand's economy is growing by a healthy 6 per cent a year. Bulwarked by \$640 million in foreign reserves, its currency is firm. Its rice production, mines and timber industries are thriving, and the number of its factories has increased ten-fold within recent years.

Once a pleasantly lazy town of canals and shaded lanes, Bangkok has boomed into a city of skyscrapers, broad avenues and traffic jams. Even in rural regions there are hints of prosperity in the Buffalo Boys carrying transistor radios, and bare-breasted peasant girls wearing hair-curlers.

But in several respects, this picture of a steady, progressive Thailand is deceptive. While performing well at present, the country's economy faces future problems. These could undermine a political regime that is scarcely as solid as it seems.

As Thai economists point out there is virtually no cohesion between industrial and agricultural development. Most Thai factories are assembly or packing plants that rely on imported components and raw materials. Agricultural output, mainly rice, is exported in order to pay for the industrial imports.

A peculiar feature of the Thai rice trade is a government premium imposed on the export to raise revenue consequently, peasants receive only about 45 per cent of the world market price for their rice. As a Bangkok economist explained recently, "This amounts to a very high rate of taxation on the poorest sector of the country."

UNEVEN INCOME PATTERN

As in other underdeveloped countries peasants are inching along while city bankers, merchants and contractors are reaping fortunes, and this uneven income pattern is bound to be compounded by population growth.

Increasing at 3 per cent or more a year, Thailand's population is expanding faster than its national per capita income. A generation from now, moreover, about half of the total population will be under the age of 15, meaning that the burden of supporting the country will rest on a small labor force. Coupled with the uncertainties of the Thai economy is the questionable equilibrium of the country's political structure in the years ahead. It is top-heavy and may prove to be balanced on too narrow a base.

King Bhumipol, one of the few solemn Thais, works hard as a national emblem, and shares the hawkish views of Thailand's real rulers, the military oligarchy that calls itself the "revolutionary government."

Actually, the "revolutionary government" is dedicated to the preservation of the status quo. Its key figures are Marshal Thanom Kittakachorn, the Premier, and Gen. Praphas Charusathien, Deputy Premier, army commander in chief and minister of Interior. The two men, whose children are married to each other, make a singular pair.

WILL DO GOOD

Thanom is handsome, amiable, honest, magnanimous and determined, he has said, to "do good." Praphas is porcine, authoritarian and allegedly immersed in a vast variety of money-making ventures. His unsavory reputation probably prevents Praphas from making an open bid for power. But he exerts a significant amount of weight in the regime.

Corruption is a built-in feature of Thai governments. When he died in late 1963, Premier Sarit Thanarat was found to have amassed an estimated \$140 million through devious means. Though Thanom is considered clean, his associates are reportedly making fortunes from assorted business deals. Much of this money is used to purchase the loyalty of subordinates.

Graft at the top may not visibly irritate the public. But it sets an example for lesser officials, with the result that virtually no government service here, from getting a telephone to a driver's license, is possible without a payoff.

Supporters of the regime insist that the Thais tolerate corruption as part of the system. But when the local press, closely supervised by the government, was free to comment on Sarit's speculations, the tone of indignation ran high.

For over seven years, a constituent assembly has been drafting a constitution without the end in sight. After seeing parts of the

draft recently, Praphas called it "too glaringly democratic," adding that elections would make Thailand "a colony of Communist China."

The likelihood of representative government evolving here seems remote at the moment. In the view of some observers, continued dictatorship in Thailand suits the United States, since it assures a continuation of American bases in the country and that, as a U.S. official put it bluntly, "is our real interest in this place."

How much pressure exists in Thailand for more liberal government is hard to measure, since the vehicles for free expression are limited. But people can talk as they please, and among Westernized students, editors and officials there seems to be rather haphazard longing for something other than this regime.

As it has elsewhere, this kind of talk may gradually proliferate. And it could reveal substance beneath the inscrutable Thai smile—unless it becomes a frown.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 21, 1966]

A SILENT PARTNER FOR UNITED STATES IN ASIA

(By Peter Braestrup)

BANGKOK, THAILAND, August 20.—Thailand's role as a partner of the United States, Ambassador Graham A. Martin suggested recently, "is not sufficiently understood back in America."

Thus, as Prime Minister Thanom Kittakachorn listened, came a rare public hint at Thailand's silent but vital role as host to 25,000 American servicemen, most of them supporting the unsung "aerial second front" against North Vietnam and the Ho Chi Minh trail, Hanoi's main infiltration route to South Vietnam.

Thailand cooperated with the Americans, Field Marshal Thanom declared, "because our intentions are the same." The smiling 55-year-old leader of Thailand's military-civilian regime and the American envoy spoke at the opening last week of the biggest air base constructed by the United States here to date—at Sattthip, on the Gulf of Siam.

Official statements on the future use of the new 11,500-foot runway were vague, but informants said privately that it could handle any U.S. military aircraft now flying—including the big B-52 bombers based at far-away Guam and used to hit targets in South Vietnam. But KC-135 jet tankers likely will be the base's first major tenants. They will refuel in flight the U.S. fighter-bombers bound for targets across the Mekong River from five bases already built in Thailand's upcountry.

OLD SUSPICIONS

"We've brought in a lot of gear," observed a high-ranking American officer, "and we want to bring in more."

A sixth combat airfield is being built; others are being expanded to accommodate new squadrons of F-105 and F-4C jets. In short, the U. S. Air Force's hammering at North Vietnam from Thailand has yet to reach its peak.

Despite traditional Thai suspicion of "fareng" (foreigners), the Kittakachorn regime has bet on Washington's continued willingness to help meet the human and political costs of containing Communism in Southeast Asia. But never colonized, enjoying the blessings of a rice-rich kingdom the size of France, neither the 30-million Thais nor their self-appointed political leaders rejoice over being militarily dependent on distant America.

"So far," Thai Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman said with regret in his voice recently, "we have relied on outside power to save us from being submerged."

No intimate of Lyndon Johnson's gets more irritated by the U.S. Senate's "doves" than do Mr. Thanat's associates who scorn what they term "liberal naïvete" about Asians and Asian Communists. Yet, even as they publicly condemn Hanoi and Peking, the Thai Cabinet officials, in an Oriental fashion that baffles many Westerners here, ignore or deny the fact that American aircraft attack North Vietnam from what are juridically Royal Thai Air Force bases. Why?

GOVERNMENT MOVES IN

"Hanoi has never admitted violating the Geneva accords by sending thousands of troops into Laos and South Vietnam since 1962, suggested a European diplomat. "Perhaps the Thais see no gain and some loss of diplomatic maneuverability if they publicly admit their own role in the Vietnam war."

Already assailed by Peking Radio as an "imperialist lackey," the Kittakachorn regime may also find its role and the bombing difficult to explain to remote Thai villagers whose contact with the Government, let alone foreign policy, is limited. "They would not understand," said Interior Minister Prapath Charusathian.

While it counts on American help in warding off any overt aggression from the north, the Bangkok Government is slowly coming to grips with the spreading but still low-level Communist subversion in parts of six provinces of the long-neglected northeast. To American aid advisers, it is the Vietnam of 1958-59 all over again. They note the lack of Government "presence" at village level, the northeasters' resentment of petty extortion and high-handedness by local police, and the "don't bother me" attitude of distant Bangkok bureaucrats.

But, to their credit, both the Bangkok officials and American aid planners have begun to focus on the grass roots, even if Thai spokesmen tend to emphasize the sporadic Communist terrorism.

In the Government's favor, as Americans see it, are certain economic and social factors. Unlike Vietnam, there is no pressing need for land reform since most villagers already till their own rice paddies. The weak off-suppressed Thai Communist party, unlike the Vietcong, has never been popularly identified with a nationalist struggle against foreign rule.

If Prime Minister Thanon is nominally head of a standard military "junta," he in fact heads a conservative, Army-backed coalition of generals and civilian technicians, ruling a bureaucracy that may be corrupt and self-serving, but is less than intolerable.

How quickly this regime's able, more dedicated men can shake-off bad old Thai political habits and provide a response to the Communists, may well decide Thailand's long-run future. There is new talk of the long-promised constitution and of elections. But as the young American pilots head north daily in their camouflaged jets, it is down in the rice paddies, the teak forests and the peasant shacks on stilts that the United States' silent ally faces its most immediate struggle with the Communists.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 22, 1966]

THAI HINTERLAND WORRIED BY REDS—OFFICIALS IN SOUTH WANT HELP TO THWART ANY DRIVE

(By Peter Braestrup)

SONGKHLA, THAILAND, August 17.—A high Thai official complained here today that the Government needs "to pay more attention to the provinces."

The complaint, heard often in the Thai hinterland, has become more pronounced here in the rubber-growing, tin-mining south. Budding Communist agitation and economic stagnation have begun to worry Thai officials and American advisers.

Although Premier Thanom Kittakachorn's military-civilian regime has begun a modest,

American-aided build-up in the long neglected Northeast, where pro-Peking Thai Communists have begun to ambush the police and assassinate minor officials, no such build-up has come in the 14 provinces of the south.

"The Communists down here are still organizing and recruiting," said an American specialist. "But the potential for trouble exists."

Relatively little is known about the Thai Communists in this region. Their activity—recruiting, food gathering, propaganda and jungle training—appears to be centered in the traditional bandit refuges along southern Thailand's jungle-covered mountains below the Kra Isthmus.

Parts of five provinces most affected—Songkhla, Suratthani, Trang, Phatthalung and Nakhon Sithammarat.

The five cover a ridge-studded area, roughly the size of New Hampshire, of small rubber plantations, occasional lowland rice paddies, livestock farms and coconut groves.

More prosperous than Thais in the dry northeast, most of this area's 2 million inhabitants, including sizable Malay and Chinese minorities, live in about 3,200 villages, many of which are unreachable by automobile.

According to one estimate, there are no more than 200 armed Communist-led guerrillas, as distinct from the region's active bandit population, in the five-province area. Perhaps a thousand active sympathizers, including some middle-class Thais and North Vietnamese expatriates, are believed to be helping with propaganda, recruiting, supplies and cell organizing.

Early last month, led by Special Col. Pin Thamasri, commander of the Fifth Regimental Combat Team, the first major operation against southern Thai Communists swept through the area along Route 5 between the towns of Trang and Phatthalung. The Government reported 18 guerrillas killed and 140 suspects arrested. The security forces lost 3 wounded and 1 missing.

"We have doused the flames of terrorism in that part of the country," Pote Bekkanan, commander of the Thai Criminal Investigation Bureau, announced July 5.

SOME ARE LESS SATISFIED

But in eyes of regional Thai officials, the success was limited. News of the impending operation appeared four days beforehand in the Bangkok press. The massing of policemen and troops in Trang scared off the Communist jungle-dwellers and little serious contact occurred.

As elsewhere in Thailand outside Bangkok, the Government presence is thin. In the five-province area troubled by Communist Thais, the only army troops are two battalions of the Fifth Regimental Combat Team stationed at Hat Yai, 15 miles southwest of here, and at Nakhon Sithammarat. For the whole 14-province Thai south, embracing 3.2 million people, there are fewer than 5,000 poorly paid provincial policemen. The villages have no police of their own.

Last June, after a tour of the south, Saard Tansubhapol, director of the Public Welfare College in Bangkok, caused a minor scandal on his return by reporting that the situation was "chaotic" in many districts. He said "neglect of villagers and their harassment by terrorist-suppression officers is turning the people of the south to banditry, which is one step from conversion to Communism."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 15, 1966]
APATHY ON COMING VOTE FOUND IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, August 14.—"This election," a Western diplomat said the other day, "is more a diplomatic exercise than a political event."

The comment seemed just. With election day, Sept. 11, only four weeks away, and with the campaign to open officially Aug. 26, less than two weeks hence, the election of a constituent assembly for South Vietnam is clearly arousing far greater interest in Washington than in Saigon.

In fact, the South Vietnamese appear to be bored by the whole thing.

People in such places as Saigon, Nhatrang, Danang, and My Tho are preoccupied with the cost of pork and rice and charcoal. Despite the devaluation of the Vietnamese piaster, members of the middle class are still pinched by inflation, and the election offers them no remedy.

AMMUNITION FOR WASHINGTON

The greatest significance of the voting, most observers here believe, is that it will afford the Johnson Administration a rejoinder to critics who frown on its support of an "illegitimate" military Government.

Domestically, the election is meaningful chiefly as a first tentative step toward representative government.

It is important to realize what the election is not.

It is not a test between the Vietcong and the non-Communist nationalists for the Vietcong have been excluded, as far as possible, from the candidate and voter lists. It is not a referendum on the American presence here, even by implication. It is not an election for a national legislature.

The sole purpose of the voting, under the electoral law promulgated by the junta, is to choose a 117-member constituent assembly charged with writing a new national constitution. Once that is done, a legislature is to be elected sometime next year.

Although many cynical South Vietnamese civilian politicians have searched diligently, they have uncovered no evidence of fraud on the part of the regime of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky. Neither have foreign correspondents or the political specialists of Western embassies in Saigon.

LARGE TURNOUT SOUGHT

The Government's interest appears to lie elsewhere. Premier Ky has made it clear to his confidants that he understands the symbolic nature of the voting, and has told them he is eager to have a large voter turnout.

Under one plan that has powerful support within the junta, a large turnout would not be left to chance. Citizens whose voting cards had not been punched at the polls would be denied certain privileges, possibly including the right to government rice doles. Few Vietnamese would fail to cast their ballots under that threat.

Of the total population of 15.5 million in South Vietnam, the potential electorate is slightly more than 5 million. Most Government officials, as well as the United States Embassy, would be pleased with a turnout between 3.5 and 4 million.

The civilian politicians do not expect the figure to be that high, if there is no tinkering. One prominent nationalist has been quoted as having predicted that as much as a third of the Saigon electorate would stay away because of suspicions of possible government manipulation and from sheer indifference.

Such attitudes have become typical over the years. The French made little effort to instill in the Vietnamese an understanding of the processes of self-government, and their successors have habitually resorted to fraud.

The politicians have done little to breathe life into the election. They have formed no meaningful coalitions, and many have denounced the electoral law at every turn.

The Vietnamese Nationalist party has refused to align itself with any other party. Many of its leading figures, including Dr.

August 30, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20283

Phan Huy Quat, a former Premier, have chosen not to run.

"We don't think it is necessary to waste money," a spokesman for the party said recently.

BODY HELD POWERLESS

Much of the bitterness of the professionals centers on Article 20 of the electoral law, which was added by the junta to the draft prepared by a special commission. It gives the generals the right to change any part of the new constitution unless two-thirds of the constituent assembly objects.

That would mean that the junta could control the assembly with a third of the votes plus one, or 40 votes.

"Under this system the assembly has no power," a prominent anti-Government lawyer said. "It is an antidemocratic system, and it robs the whole process of meaning."

Although Premier Ky has been behaving like a politician in recent weeks—defense of the idea of invading North Vietnam was widely interpreted as an effort to prove that he could be independent of the United States—there is no clear evidence that he has succeeded in forming a large bloc of candidates loyal to him and the other generals.

Of 554 candidates certified, fewer than 50 are soldiers. That would not appear to provide a sufficiently broad base for the "khaki party" that some of the members of the junta have discussed.

Most Communist candidates apparently decided not to run or were weeded out by screening boards at lower levels. Only about 10 were excluded by the national review committee under the stringent anti-Communist, antineutralist provisions of the law.

Among other groups, one of the strongest is likely to be composed of members of the provincial councils, who have already begun to coalesce into a working unit.

The militant Buddhists, whose anti-Government agitation prompted the junta to schedule the election, do not appear to be making a major effort to elect representatives to the assembly. The faction's leading monks are still talking of a boycott as proposed in May by their leader, Thich Tri Quang.

Even before the campaign begins, two things seem certain: that the constitution drafters will decide upon a presidential rather than a parliamentary form of government, a preference shared by the junta and its harshest critics, and that no single political group will be able to dominate the assembly.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1966]
SAIGON HEARS CONSTITUTION WILL BE DELAYED
(By Ward Just, Washington Post foreign service)

SAIGON, August 19.—Vietnamese officials here now are talking of a hiatus of one year between the Sept. 11 election of a constituent assembly and the drafting of a constitution.

It is expected that it will take another six months to put the national election machinery in motion, which would mean Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky and his military Directorate, or Junta would remain in office until early in 1968.

Observers here had expected that the constituent assembly would finish its work by January or February next year and Prime Minister Ky himself has talked of a presidential election by next summer.

But today an informed Vietnamese official said that the assembly was bound to be "slow" and unlikely to finish its work before next summer. The official said there were bound to be several "readings" of the constitution and time-consuming public discussion.

It all added up, he said, to a possible 18 months before the Vietnamese have an elected government.

In the interim, the official said, the Ky regime would soldier on.

The latest estimate is that 5 million Vietnamese are eligible to go to 5,283 polling places Sept. 11. There are 104 Vietnamese seats, four seats allotted to areas largely inhabited by Cambodians, and nine seats to be elected by what are called "customary tribal processes" of the Montagnards, who live in the Vietnamese central highlands.

There are 55 members of the Vietnamese armed forces running for seats, but authoritative sources here believe they will win fewer than 10 per cent of the seats. There are 572 candidates in all.

Attention here has centered on the so-called military candidates, since there has been suspicion that the 10-general junta would attempt to steamroller the election. Speculation has been further heightened by the presence of the 800,000 Vietnamese under arms. The presumption has been that the military men as voters would follow the lead of their superiors.

Interest grew with the promulgation of the decree determining the frame of reference of the constituent assembly. It appeared that the junta could overturn any decision of the assembly by affirmation of one-third plus one of the 117 delegates. Put another way, it would take a two-thirds majority to override any suggestions of the junta.

But authoritative sources said that there was every expectation that the assembly would be a fragmented body. The sources said it was not in any degree plausible that military candidates could win one-third of the seats: They doubted, even, that all the military candidates agreed with one another.

The seats are allotted according to the vote in the provincial elections of May, 1965. In that election, there were 4.7 million eligibles and 3.4 million voters. There are approximately 14.5 million people in South Vietnam, of whom an estimated 10 million are under government control.

The Prime Minister is said to view the size of the vote as an expression of confidence in his regime. This has led to lively speculation as to what is a satisfactory turnout, with cautious United States officials suggesting 50 per cent of the eligibles. Bolder and presumably more realistic Vietnamese suggest anything less than 70 per cent must be considered unsatisfactory.

In this connection, there were warnings of Vietcong attempts to disrupt polling. The Vietcong, diplomatic sources here said, view the election "with considerable seriousness as a dangerous enterprise." Officials cited threats to candidates, and intelligence reports which indicated the Communists might try to march off "whole village populations" into the jungle before the vote.

Considerable suspicion among Vietnamese, has surrounded the campaign, which will formally begin Aug. 26. There have been dark hints and innumerable rumors that the regime has sought to rig the vote, but independent observers have yet to surface any firm evidence of chicanery, fraud or intimidation.

There has been lively controversy here on precisely what the government would like to see emerge. The Prime Minister is on record as supporting a strong presidential type constitution, a view which is supported by many of the "heavyweight" candidates, ("There aren't many George Washingtons in this crowd," said one experienced observer of Vietnamese politics, referring to the bulk of the candidates).

What the government would surely not want to see is an assembly which would vote no-confidence resolution in the junta and transform itself into a legislature, an act which was much discussed by Buddhist militants during the political upheaval last spring.

The election is an analyst's nightmare.

Only the Hoa Hao, the religious-cum-political sect of the Mekong Delta, is contesting the election as a Party. In central Vietnam, the Vietnam Quoc Dan Dang (VNQDD), a nationalist party constructed along the lines of the Chinese Kuomintang, is tilting for a dozen seats—but there are several VNQDD factions tilting and there is no assurance that the winners will stick together in the assembly. Similarly, observers doubt if either the Dia Viet Party or the Cao Dai religionists will emerge as cohesive units.

It is for this reason that observers here show great interest in the military candidates. In the assembly likely to result from these elections, a bloc of 10 could be a political powerhouse. The military candidates, presumably loyal to the regime, could be the single united force.

There are as yet no reliable estimates of the mischief potential of the militant Buddhists and the dissident amalgam known as the Front of Citizens of All Faiths. Independent observers tend to discount the influence of both, but today the front issued another communique and in the strongest terms to date called for the boycotting of the election of what it called "the puppet assembly."

There is now, among reliable observers of Vietnamese affairs, skepticism of too elaborate and intricate an analysis of the events about to unfold. There has scarcely been enough time for either the government or its opponents to mount effective campaigns, even if there were general agreement on desirable goals which there apparently is not.

CORRUPTION, THIEVERY, AND BRIBERY IN SAIGON

Mr. GRUENING, Mr. President, on August 24, 1966, CBS-TV broadcast an account by Morley Safer in Saigon of the widespread corruption and theft of U.S. aid commodities he found at the port of Saigon and elsewhere in Vietnam. Much of what Mr. Safer reported had been known previously. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has, in recent weeks, inserted a number of accounts of the extent of the pilferage and graft prevailing in Vietnam. There are, however, two new points in the August 24 telecast.

Mr. Safer reports that an investigation is currently underway of the incidents in which the South Vietnamese Navy has given escort and safe conduct to sampans carrying food and supplies to Vietcong units in the Mekong Delta. This may well explain the reports we have been getting lately that the United States plans on sending its combat forces into the delta area for the first time. If the South Vietnamese forces are working hand in glove with the Vietcong, the administration may have despaired of achieving any results in the delta area unless it came under the complete control of U.S. forces. Since the South Vietnamese will not fight the Vietcong, our boys will do the fighting for them. These are the people for whom we are sacrificing untold blood and treasure allegedly for their freedom.

The second point is the admission by Mr. Rutherford Poats, an Assistant Administrator of AID, that there is little that AID can do about the corruption and theft of economic assistance commodities. This is the first time I have seen such an admission which is indicative of how large and deep rooted the

20284

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 30, 1966

black market organization has become. This should not be surprising however. The United States has been pouring hundreds of millions of dollars of commodities of all descriptions into a backward country. This uncontrolled flow of goods represents a golden opportunity for the profiteers and for Vietnamese Government officials to make a "quick buck" by dealing with the Vietcong. The scale of our aid program in Vietnam becomes the main factor reinforcing the graft and corruption which Morley Safer points out exists at the very highest level of the Ky government. An aid program designed to alleviate the misery and poverty brought on by the ravages of war ends up by becoming a major cause for increasing the misery and poverty of the masses of people in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion of the CBS-TV transcript in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

SAFER. This is a town that makes the mind boggle. What started out as a routine inquiry into the increasing incidence of pilferage here at the Port of Saigon has produced a series of almost frightening facts. Here are some of them: an investigation is currently under way to incidents in which the South Vietnamese Navy has given escort and safe conduct to sampans carrying food and supplies to Viet Cong units in the Mekong Delta. These supplies include U.S. AID materials, stolen or purchased on the black market. This is not an isolated incident; it is a regular practice. It appears that running parallel with the war is a national symphony of theft, corruption and bribery. Much of it begins right here in the Port of Saigon. No one in Vietnam is able to specify how much is lost or stolen at the port of entry. The estimates vary from four percent to twenty. Patrol boats keep a constant watch on the river for mines and smugglers, but American security is limited to the military side of the port. There is no U.S. control of commercial docking facilities and here in the Saigon River, piracy and theft is a way of life. Tight control is almost impossible. The river teems with barges and sampans, some of them chartered to transport companies, some simply in the business of theft . . . some doing both. Military does what it can—military warehouses are kept under constant watch but huge caches of items like beer manage to disappear, and it's not individual pilfering, it's a gigantic controlled racket. Beer, C-rations, luxury goods consigned to the commissaries and post exchanges. Army Captain Robert Moran works for the management of the Saigon Port:

There must be some kind of organization behind this stuff, it's not just taken on an individual basis, would you say so?

MORAN. I agree, very much. The individual amount of pilfering wouldn't add up to the amount of black market activity. We do frisk everyone who comes in and out of these port facilities so this would eliminate individual thievery. Some speculation has been that there is, uh, organized groups of people who attempt to take these goods and sell them on the open market.

SAFER. Whole consignments of PX goods—blankets, C-rations, end up in Vietnam's open black markets. There are three in Saigon and they handle cameras, radios, whiskey, all clearly labelled for use of U.S. Military forces. The market is so free of the fear of arrest that no one even bothers to remove the labels. The U.S. AID emblem, the clasped hands of friendship, is liberally displayed for all to see, including the national police. They saunter among the stalls,

never making a seizure or an arrest. This is the lowest level of bribery. American investigators have traced it upwards to middle level of government, police and army. But they rely on Vietnamese agencies, Vietnamese police, to make arrests. The story is always the same: a man of influence is involved. He has been fined but we can go no further. What does happen, according to U.S. sources, is that police then shake down this person of influence, blackmail him with the threat of turning him over to the Americans. He always pays up. The black market is the smallest and the most overt example of how funds, food and goods are diverted from the Vietnamese economy directly into the hands of private speculators, and from there into the hands of the Viet Cong. This is one of the most lucrative rackets of all—the traffic in milk. At any Saigon corner you can buy for a dollar a box, give-away U.S. AID powdered milk. There is no attempt to conceal the fact. The box is marked with the clasped hands and the stars and stripes and emblazoned with the motto: Not to be sold or exchanged. American economic warfare personnel advises the Vietnamese government that one way of controlling the movement and distribution of material was to check every vehicle leaving Saigon for the provinces. The roadblocks were duly set up, but their establishment was an invitation for the national police to shake down both the guilty and the innocent truckers and distributors. AID material is not affected by this unofficial tax but all other goods leaving Saigon are taxed. Not at the roadblocks themselves but in the privacy of an office or police station. Honest officials do turn up but they are soon transferred by their superiors.

These practices can never be eradicated simply because the United States does not control the internal affairs of this country. Even in this appropriation of AID money and food is something that we have learned to live with in Vietnam and a lot of other countries. But there is evidence now that the Viet Cong political and economic infrastructure is directly tied to the blackmarket. The blackmarket is directly tied to important elements in Premier Ky's government. One American official whose job is to deprive the Viet Cong of resources told CBS News:

The enemy's procurement program is extremely sophisticated. It is meshed into the national economic program and relies heavily on the blackmarket.

Another American source who is in close contact with the harassed officers in Saigon and Washington says: It is our biggest problem in fighting this war.

Morley Safer, CBS News, Saigon.

CRONKITE. In Washington, Marvin Kalb asked for reaction to the Safer report from Rutherford Poats, Assistant Foreign Aid Administrator for the Far East.

POATS. It's a very tough problem. As you know, the Viet Cong are everywhere. They are in the life blood of the economy. We have never had that problem before like this, we've never fought a war like this. There are no lines. Business is done from one Vietnamese to another. They're all in similar clothing, look alike, live in the same areas, and yet unless we can check the flow of supplies to the Viet Cong, they will obviously be able to carry on the war that much longer. If we cannot hurt them in their areas, they'll be able to continue to struggle. But we do consider it a major problem and it's a very tough one to solve.

KALB. Mr. Poats, are we capable of cutting off this flow of supplies to the Viet Cong?

POATS. No. I think we should face squarely that we are not fully capable of doing it. In the first place, V.C. areas are pockmarked throughout the country. You may find a village which is in government control and immediately around it are peo-

ple who are friendly to the V.C., whose sons or father are out with the V.C. part time or full time. These villagers must be supplied. Commercial trucks bring them supplies, both imported goods and domestic goods. We cannot break this entirely. Now if we erected—the Vietnamese Government erects—a wall of policemen around each port, around each area of production of industrial goods or rice, and attempt to stop the flow of traffic between these areas, they will starve large areas of the country that we hope to win over, where we hope to gradually push back the tide of Viet Cong control. So we also have problems of corruption, as Mr. Safer pointed out. It's impossible to run a large-scale police check point system as is being attempted now without some police seeing an opportunity to get a small bribe for letting something go through. This does happen, but we don't think it happens nearly as much as some of the rumors around Saigon suggest.

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the fifth of a series of insertions regarding school prayer. Previous insertions were made on August 23, 24, 25, 26, and 29 and can be found on pages 19427, 19594, 19706, and 20205, respectively.

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

STATEMENT OF DANIEL J. O'CONNOR, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 148, AUGUST 8, 1966

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I wish to express our sincere appreciation for the opportunity you have afforded The American Legion and The American Legion Auxiliary in presenting our position in support of S.J. Res. 148 with respect to a proposed constitutional amendment, which provides that nothing contained in the Constitution of the United States shall prohibit the authority administering any school, school system, educational institution or other public building supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds from providing for or permitting the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer. We fully support the prohibition against any public authority prescribing the form or content of any prayer but heartily endorse the right of any person under the First Amendment to participate in prayer.

Mr. Chairman, our statement is that of The American Legion and its Auxiliary and we are not allied with any other organization. We stand completely on our own as a Congressionally chartered organization dedicated to service for God and country.

We will endeavor to avoid repetitious arguments and give you our reasons in favor of such constitutional amendment, but there are a few poignant remarks which we believe are necessary in the light of statements which have appeared through the communication media concerning the motives of those who favor the United States Supreme Court decisions, and of the Court itself. We assure you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, that we strongly support all three branches of the Government—the Executive, the Legislative, and the Judiciary. We believe in the system of checks and balances. However, we may differ, at times, on how those functions are carried out, and more particularly whether on occasion the Judi-

August 30, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20295

is a committee meeting downstairs that I would like to attend.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 234 Leg.]

Alken	Kennedy, N.Y.	Nelson
Allott	Kuchel	Proxmire
Bass	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Burdick	Long, La.	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Magnuson	Russell, Ga.
Cannon	McCarthy	Smith
Dirksen	McGovern	Talmadge
Ellender	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Monroney	Williams, Del.
Gruening	Montoya	Yarborough
Holland	Morse	Young, Ohio
Jordan, N.C.	Morton	
Kennedy, Mass.	Moss	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Anderson	Ervin	Miller
Bayh	Fannin	Mundt
Bible	Griffin	Neuberger
Brewster	Harris	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Hart	Pell
Carlson	Hartke	Prouty
Clark	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Cooper	Hill	Smathers
Cotton	Hruska	Sparkman
Curtis	Jackson	Stennis
Dodd	Javits	Symington
Dominick	Mansfield	Thurmond
Eastland	McGee	Young, N. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). A quorum is present.

TREASURY CONCEDES JOB, WON BY McCLOSKEY, FOR MINT COULD COST TAXPAYERS \$4 MILLION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last week I called the attention of the Senate to the highly irregular procedure followed by the GSA in awarding to McCloskey & Co. the contract to build the Philadelphia Mint. Following that statement, the various agencies stampeded each other in an attempt to justify their action.

In today's Wall Street Journal there appears an article entitled "Treasury Concedes Job, Won by McCloskey, for Mint Could Cost Taxpayers \$4 Million." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

TREASURY CONCEDES JOB, WON BY McCLOSKEY, FOR MINT COULD COST TAXPAYERS \$4 MILLION

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—Government officials concede that the award of a \$12.8 million contract to build the Philadelphia mint could cost the taxpayers at least \$4 million. The

contract was won by Democratic fund-raiser Matthew H. McCloskey.

In further reply to Republican accusations of favoritism to the construction company Mr. McCloskey founded, embarrassed Treasury officials also are retracting in part earlier claims to Congress that getting the new mint built fast would save scads of money.

Thus does the Government explain the paradox of how Mr. McCloskey's concern benefited both from a clamorous urgency to build and from a subsequent decision to stretch out the construction. "This time Matt's people were lucky, that's all," one official asserted. Another said Big Government's cumbersome decision-making processes compounded the luck.

Meantime the General Services Administration, the Government's contracting agency, has accepted the company's contention that strikes and snowstorms were responsible for failure to meet an April 3 deadline imposed by a separate \$2.7 million contract for the mint's substructure. The GSA decision relieved the company of perhaps \$300,000 in potential penalties.

BYPASSING SEALED BIDS

On the bigger contract for the superstructure, the company's streak of luck began in May when the GSA, pressed by the Treasury, bypassed normal sealed competitive bidding for urgency's sake. Officials decided that selecting the contractor through the assertedly faster method of negotiated procurement was necessary to help lick the coin shortage.

Besides, as Assistant Treasury Secretary Robert A. Wallace told a House Appropriations subcommittee on March 3, "the funds you approved for the construction of the new mint in Philadelphia will enable us to save the taxpayers approximately \$1 million a month when we put these new, fully integrated facilities into operation in 1967."

Moving at full tilt in disregard of a Cabinet meeting April 1 at which President Johnson directed a slowdown in Government construction to douse inflationary fires, the GSA on May 27 invited contractors to submit proposals that would serve as a starting point for negotiations. In response on June 24, the GSA received two quotes from McCloskey & Co.: \$13,227,565 to complete the job in 18 months and \$17,195,834 if the work had to be compressed into 12 months. These quotes were, respectively, \$447,565 and \$3,384,384 higher than those submitted by a competitor, J. W. Bateson & Co., of Arlington, Va.

Despite the presumed necessity for speed, the GSA didn't start negotiations with the contractors. Instead, it waited until June 29 for Mr. McCloskey's son, Thomas, the company president, to drop by with revised proposals that undercut Bateson's. McCloskey & Co.'s new quotes lopped \$545,000 from its original 18-month price. And for the 12-month period, McCloskey proposed a far bigger bargain, \$4,102,269 below the first quote.

SEEMING GIANT BARGAIN

At first glance, McCloskey & Co.'s ability to chop more than \$4 million from its 12-month construction proposal seemed to offer a giant bargain indeed. Completing the mint in a year would cost the Government just \$411,000 more than if 18 months were allowed, the revised McCloskey proposals stated. Matched against Assistant Secretary Wallace's \$1-million-a-month estimate of savings, the somewhat higher cost of compressing the construction timetable seemed trivial; by getting the mint in operation quickly, taxpayers could save \$5.6 million—if the estimate given Congress was accurate.

Mr. Wallace's testimony, Treasury officials say, was based on presumably careful calculations compiled under the direction of Eva Adams, director of the Mint. By her estimate, operating the new Philadelphia facil-

ity would be \$125,000 a month more efficient than the old. In addition, the new mint would save from \$750,000 to \$1,181,000 every month (depending on the rate of coin production) by melting, rolling and casting coin strip; the old mint buys strip from contractors at higher cost. Even at the lower rate, the six-month saving comes to \$4.5 million, or \$4.1 million net if the total is reduced by the higher cost of compressing construction.

Yet when decision day for awarding the contract arrived on June 29 the Treasury ignored the claims Miss Adams had pressed on Congress to help extract construction appropriations. Treasury Under Secretary Joseph Barr declined the McCloskey 12-month bargain, in part, the Treasury says, "because he didn't believe previous estimates of savings given by the mint were correct." Instead, Mr. Barr recommended and the GSA awarded McCloskey & Co. an 18-month contract for \$12,882,565, just \$97,000 below the losing quote submitted by Bateson & Co.

One reason given for the change was the rapid disappearance of the coin shortage, which reduced projected estimates of coin production. And, as an aide explains, "she (Miss Adams) got carried away. She's a promoter, you understand. Her heart and soul is in this new mint."

President Johnson's April request to stretch out Government construction was another factor prompting Mr. Barr to rein in the GSA's pell-mell rush to get the mint built, though that rush was still deemed sufficient in May to justify the negotiated procurement by which McCloskey & Co. won the construction contract.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I say that it is time that the GSA revised its bidding procedures. There is no excuse for the manner in which this particular contract was handled. Why was Mr. McCloskey excused from the \$300,000 penalty for delayed completion of the substructure contract on this same building?

This type of favoritism is costing our taxpayers millions.

HOWARD K. SMITH TELLS WHY UNITED STATES MUST NOT LOSE IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, too little has been said about why we simply cannot afford to lose in Vietnam. And too little has been said about what a long, tough, grueling, and painful war this is likely to be before it ends.

This Vietnam war is going to last for years. It will cost the lives of thousands of Americans and billions of dollars, and that cannot be said often enough. The sooner the American people fully recognize the painful cost of this war, and the sooner the North Vietnamese know that they recognize it, and the necessity for this heavy sacrifice the more likely it will be that North Vietnam will agree to consider the beginning of negotiation.

It is also necessary that the American people realize that we are not going to win any smashing American victory. Indeed the majority leader spoke wisely yesterday in insisting that the administration is not seeking any total military victory or unconditional surrender.

At best, we will win an opportunity for the South Vietnamese to determine what kind of government they want, without alinement with this country, without an American base in Vietnam, and without any assurance that South

Vietnam will not choose communism if they desire it.

Why, in view of the heavy sacrifice we will have to make and the apparently feeble benefit to this country, must we continue?

The answer, Mr. President, was brilliantly expressed in last night's Washington Star by Howard K. Smith.

Mr. Smith argues that America must not lose this war for two reasons:

First. If we should lose or withdraw, wars of liberation would become a certainty throughout the world, not only in Asia, but also in Africa and South America. The collapse of American power at the hands of a guerrilla band, supplied primarily by a relatively primitive country of 16 million people, would signal a feeble and helpless United States.

Second. The result of such a fiasco would be—as Mr. Smith points out—a super response to the next serious engagement, with a million American troops and an all-out reduce-the-enemy-to-the-stone-ages type bombing.

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

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

PRICE OF U.S. DEFEAT IN VIET NAM TOO COSTLY

(By Howard K. Smith)

We shall win the war in Viet Nam—that is, attain our oft-stated objectives. We shall do so for the simple reason that there is no alternative.

If we should lose and withdraw, or negotiate an empty agreement, every little band of politicians unable to win by consent in Latin America would acquire itself a Cuban adviser and have a go at a "War of Liberation." In half the countries of the world, the topical amusement would be going downtown to wreck the American embassy. That nearly happened in the period before we began seriously resisting in Viet Nam. After we began resisting, Ben Bella, Nkrumah and Sukarno lost power in succession and our embassies became their prosaic selves once again.

Nothing as epic as a decline or collapse of American power in the world would result from failure in Viet Nam. Instead, in the next serious engagement—say, in Thailand—an overwrought American opinion would insist on victory at any price. We would put not 300,000 but 3 million troops into combat. Gen. Westmoreland's promising career would end with a desk in the Pentagon, and the most uncompromising hawk would be called in to "bomb them back into the Stone Age." Our politics would once again be poisoned as at the time of McCarthy.

These things simply cannot be allowed to happen. So we shall have to straighten out the real facts about guerrilla war and win.

Guerrilla wars are won by one thing, and that is attrition. Two tough entities grate against one another until the tougher rubs the other to pieces.

The idea that the side closest to the common people wins is a romantic notion. In fact, the side that wins is almost always the side that gets the most abundant help from a nearby foreign power. In the Napoleonic wars, only a British invasion enabled the Spanish guerrillas to be successful. In World War II, no guerrilla movement had much chance until abundant Allied aid and an Allied invasion of Europe became real prospects. After that war, the Greek Communist guerrillas flowered while Tito provided a flood of support and a ready refuge. But when he shut the border, they withered.

Ho Chi Minh would never have won in North Viet Nam had not China gone Communist next to him. He could not fight now but for a flood of help from outside: all his oil, all his trucks, all his aircraft and anti-aircraft defense, and almost all his arms and ammunition come from other Communist nations. Though the fighting in South Viet Nam is not a simple invasion from the North, it could not last 12 months on a serious scale if North Viet Nam stopped sending men and material.

Well, the foreign country with power to make up for lack of proximity is the U.S. With our impressive native talent for improvisation—trying and failing until eventually we find the right way—we are making that power increasingly effective.

But it will take time and patience, which are not usually American virtues. We are adjusted to short-term results, to annual sessions of Congress, annual budgets and annual company reports. For this effort we have to adjust to the long, long haul.

We must learn to shrug off setbacks and disappointments, and even occasional disasters. The Communists have a 20-year head start in singing their "infrastructure" into South Viet Nam, and we have only been seriously learning to root it out for about a year.

We shall have to keep in mind that our saturation reporting of our own problems, compared with a near blackout on information from the enemy, creates the false impression that only we have problems. In fact, what evidence there is suggests that the Communists' problems are much worse and are growing more so each month.

We need to keep clear the fact that this is really a job of nation-building disguised as a war. Despite the subtlety and difficulty of the mission the prospects are good. The people with whom we work are clever. Their country is rich and can grow anything in abundance. Both the Buddhist demonstrations of last summer, and the firmness with which order was restored, are tokens of a crystallizing nation.

The raw materials are right and so are we. We could possibly talk ourselves into defeat, and a fraction of our intellectuals are giving it a hard try. But probably they shall not succeed. The easiest path is success, and in our usual halting way, we are moving along that path.

EIGHT PERCENT RISE IN MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES DRIVES HOUSING COSTS UP SHARPLY IN PAST 6 MONTHS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, too little attention has been paid to the full

consequences of restrictive monetary policy and high interest rates on the cost of living.

The classical argument is that tight credit and high interest rates will discourage prospective home buyers, businessmen planning expansion, auto buyers, and others who want to spend money, from borrowing to spend. The tight credit is supposed to cut down on spending. And, of course, to some extent it does. It has, in fact, sharply depressed the homebuilding industry. It has probably discouraged some small businessmen from borrowing to meet big business competition, and it has persuaded municipalities contemplating school building, for example, to postpone their plans.

In this sense, tight money may have contributed to reducing demand and kept this kind of pressure off prices. On the other hand, it has contributed directly to a high cost of living.

I have just received from the Bureau of Labor Statistics an analysis which, for the first time, to my knowledge, separates out the rise in interest rates in determining the big cost of housing element, in the cost of living.

Since the big cost of living rise began last February 1 until the latest available report on the cost of living—for last month—housing costs rose by 1.9 percent—2.1 points. During this same period, however, mortgage interest rates by themselves rose a whopping 8 percent.

The Bureau of Labor statisticians tell me that their analysis shows that if one takes the soaring 8-percent rise of mortgage interest rates out of the increase in housing, one subtracts more than one-third of the full housing rise. In fact, of the 1.9-percent rise, 0.7 percent was the result of higher mortgage interest rates. Without the rise in interest rates, the rise in housing costs would have been not 1.9 percent but 1.2 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the rise in the cost of living since January by percentage be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

1966 chart

	January	July	+ points	Percent change
All items.....	111.0	113.3	+2.3	2.1
Food.....	111.4	114.3	+2.9	2.6
Housing ¹	109.2	111.3	+2.1	1.9
Apparel.....	107.3	109.2	+1.9	1.8
Transportation.....	111.2	113.5	+2.3	2.1
Health and recreation.....	116.9	119.1	+2.2	1.9
Medical.....	(124.2)	(127.7)	(+3.5)	2.8
All items, less food.....	111.1	113.2	+2.1	1.9
All commodities.....	107.4	109.3	+1.9	1.8
All services.....	119.5	122.6	+3.1	2.6
Home ownership.....	113.1	116.2	+3.1	2.7

¹ See the following table:
 Mortgage interest rate index itself up..... **8.0**
 Of the housing component..... **1.9**
 Mortgage interest rise accounts for..... **.7**
 Without rise housing would have increased..... **1.2**

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Public Law 89-258: Expansion of loan service of educational media for the deaf.

Public Law 89-286: Labor standards for persons employed by Federal contractors.

Public Law 89-287: Financial assistance for students attending trade, technical, business and other vocational schools, after secondary education.

Public Law 89-313: Providing for assistance in construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by major disaster.

Public Law 89-329: Strengthening the educational resources of our colleges and universities; and to financially assist such students.

Public Law 89-333: Amending the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Public Law 89-376: Federal Coal Mine Safety.

Public Law 89-488: Amendments to the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

Public Law 89-511: Library Services and Construction Act Amendments.

CORRECTING INEQUITIES IN THE IMMIGRATION LAW REGARDING DERIVATIVE CITIZENSHIP

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I introduce a bill which would seek to correct inequities in our immigration law regarding derivative citizenship.

First, the bill would amend section 301 (a) (7) in order to correct a serious injustice against certain classes of citizens of the United States who serve this country abroad as officials or employees of the U.S. Government, or of a public international organization, and their children.

Under existing law a child born abroad to a U.S. citizen father and an alien mother, or vice versa, does not acquire U.S. citizenship at birth unless the citizen parent, prior to the birth of the child, was physically present in the United States or its outlying possessions for a period or periods totaling not less than 10 years, at least five of which were after attaining the age of 14 years. At present, only members of the Armed Forces may count the periods of honorable service abroad in order to meet the physical presence requirement of section 301(a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. My bill would merely extend the same right to those civilians serving our Government abroad.

The problem which the proposed amendment is designed to overcome is a continually recurring one and is likely to intensify in view of the large number of American parents who, in recent years, have had protracted assignments abroad in connection with their official duties.

It is particularly the sons and daughters of these parents who, if they marry a foreign national, are in many cases precluded by law from transmitting U.S. citizenship to their foreign-born children because they lack the requisite 10 years of physical presence in the United States. It is not uncommon for the children of a Foreign Service officer to spend most of their youthful years abroad accompanying the parents from one assignment to another. The proposed amendment, in effect would treat the time spent

abroad in such cases as constructive physical presence in the United States for the purpose of transmitting U.S. citizenship.

A second inequity corrected by my bill concerns section 301(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This section sets up certain requirements which a U.S. citizen child born outside the geographical limits of the United States with one parent an alien and the other a U.S. citizen must meet in order to retain his citizenship. If the citizen parent had the required physical presence in the United States the child is automatically a citizen at birth subject to the retention requirements of 5 years actual physical presence in the United States between ages 14 and 28 years.

Under the provisions of section 301(a) (7) if the U.S. citizen parent of such a child did not have the required 10 years residence in the United States before the child's birth, such child is not a citizen at birth. However, section 320(a) permits such a child to acquire derivative citizenship if the alien parent is naturalized while the child is under 16 years of age and if he begins to reside permanently in the United States while under 16 years of age. No retention requirements are placed as a condition upon his citizenship.

Thus a child who acquired U.S. citizenship at birth under section 301(a) (7) must reside in the United States for a continuous period of 5 years in order to retain that citizenship while a child obtaining derivative citizenship through the naturalization of his alien parent need not meet any such requirement. This means a child who acquired automatic citizenship at birth has a lesser status than one who acquired citizenship much later through his parent's naturalization.

My bill would merely extend the same provisions, as an alternative, to the child who is a citizen at birth, thus providing his citizenship would not be lost if his alien parent were naturalized while he is under 16 years of age and residing in the United States at the time of naturalization. This additional ground for retention of citizenship places the child who became a citizen at birth in no less a favorable position than the child who acquired citizenship by derivation.

The amendments I propose not only will correct obvious inequities, they will save the time of Members and staff. Enactment will eliminate the necessity of considering private bills designed to waive the provisions of section 301(a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. I see no reason why this time cannot be saved and these inequities corrected by the passage of my bill.

ENFORCE THE FINDLEY AMENDMENT ON NORTH VIETNAM TRADE

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.), was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, both the House and the Senate have

approved H.R. 14596, the fiscal year 1967 agriculture appropriations bill, and it is awaiting the President's signature.

Included in this bill is an extremely important amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] which prohibits Public Law 480 sales for foreign currency or sales for dollars on long-term credit to any country which furnishes or transports any commodities, materials, or supplies to North Vietnam.

This amendment applies only to the period through June 30, 1967. During this period the President should, in all good conscience, enforce this provision. In doing so, the clear intent of the Congress on this matter should be followed. The intent of the amendment is to help cut off further third-country aid and commerce to North Vietnam. Any nation which carries on commerce with North Vietnam should not be the recipient of concessional Public Law 480 sales programs from the United States.

Congress also intended that this amendment should apply to any attempted subterfuge by a Public Law 480 recipient nation. Such a nation may seek to avoid the consequences of the law by engaging in a so-called sale to a non-Public Law 480 nation which in turn would sell or give these same commodities to North Vietnam.

While recognizing the difficulty in distinguishing bona fide transactions from the pro forma type of operation that some nations might utilize to avoid the implications of the Findley amendment, I most seriously urge the President to make its prospective application crystal clear when he signs this bill and then, later, to enforce it fully.

The Congress has clearly spoken on this particular aspect of the Vietnam struggle. The President should act accordingly.

SELF-HELP AND WELFARE

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record a copy of a very thoughtful editorial appearing in the Friday, August 26, St. Louis Globe Democrat, entitled "Permissiveness and Disrespect" which discusses the troublesome problem of how do we help our neighbor.

Although there are same points with which I am not in full accord I can vouch for the accuracy of the factual points made in the Editorial and I certainly agree with its main thrust. The points of difference, I might add, involve details and nothing basic.

PERMISSIVENESS AND DISRESPECT

The Senate is presently hearing testimony on the future of our cities. The Johnson Administration has been asked to put a tentative \$250,000,000,000 price tag on help to America's urban areas.

If there was ever a case of a dog chasing his own tail, this is it. On the one hand, no one can fall to be moved by the squalor, the poverty, the frustration, the hopelessness of our slums; on the other hand, spending money apparently is not even the beginning of a

in considering the issue at hand, to base your decision only on the merits of the case, and without reference to the personalities involved.

CHAIRMAN POWELL OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

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

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I was most disappointed and shocked to hear one of our colleagues attack the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I personally regret and also resent any implication that might be conveyed by the remarks, unfortunate as I deem them to be, of one of our colleagues earlier today.

Congressman POWELL's constituents have reelected him by margins exceeded by virtually no other Member of this House.

Chairman POWELL needs no defense from this junior Member. His effective efforts as the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and the great benefits which the legislative production of that committee has brought to this country speak for themselves.

I think the Members will be interested in some of the concrete achievements of Chairman POWELL's already distinguished legislative and political career.

On June 25 of this year, the Negro newspaper publishers of America voted to give Chairman POWELL 1 of the 10 Russwurm Awards for 1966. The other nine honorees included Pope Paul VI; Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson; Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY; Attorney General NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH; Andrew BRIMMER, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; ASA T. SPAULDING, president of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co.; WILLIE MAYS, San Francisco outfielder; JOHN H. JOHNSON, publisher and editor of *Ebony*, *Jet*, and *Negro Digest*; and Gov. EDWARD T. BREATHITT of Kentucky.

Earlier this year on March 18, President Johnson wrote Chairman POWELL a letter congratulating him on his outstanding 5-year record as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee.

The President's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 18, 1966.

HON. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR ADAM: The fifth anniversary of your Chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee reflects a brilliant record of accomplishment.

It represents the successful reporting to the Congress of forty-nine pieces of bedrock legislation. And the passage of every one of these bills attests to your ability to get things done.

Even now, these laws, which you so effectively guided through the House, are finding abundant reward in the lives of our people.

The poverty program is rapidly paving new pathways to progress for those whom the economic vitality of this land had previously bypassed.

The education measures are being translated into fuller opportunity for all our citizens to develop their God-given talents to their fullest potential.

Minimum wage, long a guarantee of a fair return for an honest day's work, has been increased and greatly extended.

And the problems of juvenile delinquency are being met and curtailed by positive and determined action.

Only with progressive leadership could so much have been accomplished by one Committee in so short a time. I speak for the millions of Americans who benefit from these laws when I say that I am truly grateful.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

On the fifth anniversary of Representative POWELL's chairmanship, his office released a background summary of his political career and the list of 52 laws in the various fields of education and labor which were shepherded through his committee. That background summary follows:

THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF REPRESENTATIVE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Congressman POWELL was first elected to the 79th Congress on November 7, 1944, from Harlem, which is now the 18th Congressional District of New York State.

He became Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives in January 1961.

This year—1966—Rep. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL celebrates the completion of his fifth year as Chairman.

In the five years of his Chairmanship, Congressman POWELL has successfully guided to passage 52 major laws from his Committee. He has never had a bill from his Committee defeated once it reached the floor of the House of Representatives.

In those five years, some of the most important legislation in the history of this country and the United States Congress has been passed: Increasing the Minimum Wage, The War on Poverty, Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education, Barring Discrimination in Salaries paid to Women for the same work performed by Men, Manpower Development and Training for more Jobs, Anti-Juvenile Delinquency, Vocational Rehabilitation, School Lunch Program, Library Services.

Following is the record of the 52 laws which were passed in the first five years of Congressman POWELL's Chairmanship of the Education and Labor Committee:

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Public Law 87-22: Amending Vocational Education laws to include and help practical nurse training programs.

Public Law 87-30: Increasing the coverage of Minimum Wage legislation to include retail clerks; also increasing the minimum wage to \$1.25.

Public Law 87-87: Increased Benefits for Longshoremen and Harbor Workers.

Public Law 87-137: Provides for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Public Law 87-262: Establishes a teaching hospital for Howard University; transfers Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University.

Public Law 87-274: The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act.

Public Law 87-276: Providing for the training of teachers of the deaf and handicapped children.

Public Law 87-294: Education of the Blind.

Public Law 87-300: Study of health and safety conditions in metal mines.

Public Law 87-344: Extension of the laws providing funds for school construction and maintenance in Federally impacted areas.

Public Law 87-339: Amending the Federal Employee's Compensation Act.

Public Law 87-400: Amending the National Defense Education Act regarding student loans.

Public Law 87-415: The Manpower Development and Training Act, to make more jobs available.

Public Law 87-420: Amending the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Public Law 87-581: The Work Hours Act of 1962, establishing standards for pay and work of laborers and mechanics.

Public Law 87-715: Educational and training films for the deaf.

Public Law 87-729: Amending the Manpower Development and Training Act regarding railroad unemployment insurance.

Public Law 87-823: Liberalizing formula under National School Lunch Act.

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Public Law 88-38: Equal pay for equal work.

Public Law 88-204: Higher Education Academic Facilities Act.

Public Law 88-210: Improving the quality of vocational education, providing for its expansion and strengthening.

Public Law 88-214: Amending the Manpower and Development Training Act.

Public Law 88-269: Increasing Federal Assistance for public libraries.

Public Law 88-321: President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Public Law 88-349: Amending the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Public Law 88-368: Amending the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending it for 2 more years.

Public Law 88-444: National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Public Law 88-452: The War on Poverty.

Public Law 88-508: Amending the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

Public Law 88-579: National Council on the Arts.

Public Law 88-582: Registration of contractors of migrant workers.

Public Law 88-665: Amending and extending the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Public Law 89-10: Improving elementary and secondary educational opportunities.

Public Law 89-15: Amending the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Public Law 89-36: National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Public Law 89-69: Amending the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961.

Public Law 89-73: The Older Americans Act of 1965.

Public Law 89-77: Amending Public Law 815, providing for school construction in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

Public Law 89-125: Amending the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964.

Public Law 89-178: Providing for analysis of manpower shortage in correctional rehabilitation.

Public Law 89-209: National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Public Law 89-216: Bonding Provisions of Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

Public Law 89-253: Expanding the War on Poverty.

is that this would be a wonderful opportunity for members of the press to get into this matter and really do some exploratory work so that it would not all fall to investigators from the Republican organization to try to dig out some of these matters.

Perhaps we could get some of these things done on a less partisan basis if we could get that kind of support and interest. I make that comment as one who makes a living in the newspaper business.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman, and I would say I think there are enough leads and enough basic facts for the press to pursue this matter in regard to what I have pointed up and the others have pointed up in the previous revelations. And I would like to take this chance to comment and call attention to the Evans-Novak column last week which did make revelations with reference to \$12,000 contributions to the President's Club by a Republican and a John Bircher, who also happens to be a Government contractor.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. It will be of interest to see whether or not we can get some assistance from the press in this kind of investigation.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is safe for me to assume that of the half dozen Members on the Republican side of the aisle present here at this moment and during this discourse have any intention of joining the President's Club?

Mr. GOODELL. I do not quite understand the reason for the gentleman's question or the import of it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. May I say I had the same impression with regard to the entire discourse of the gentleman. I thought I was back in the Eisenhower administration for awhile.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the Republicans would be welcome.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am sure my dear friend from Iowa would be welcome; in fact, he and I have been looking forward to going fishing at some decent date in the future. Is that so?

Mr. GROSS. I would like nothing better, but I do not know what that has to do with joining the President's Club at \$1,000 a throw, or whatever it is.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Both have advantages. One is healthy, being outdoors; the other is a sort of indoor sport.

Mr. GOODELL. So far as I am aware right now, the only Republican that has come to my attention as a contributor to the President's Club is the John Bircher. Apparently it is the John Birschers who are welcome there. But I would say in answer to my colleague's question on the other side that there should be no implication in any of the questions that are raised that we who want these matters investigated are against campaign contributions. It is the lifeblood of a political party. What is wrong is when there is a campaign contribution that is made under the cloud of an implication that influence will be gained in matters before

the Federal Government, and that is the way the President's Club was born, under that cloud, the direct and intentional implication being made that if you want to get ahead, join the President's Club.

That is what is wrong in this whole matter, and that is why the only solution will be a full investigation of the President's Club and Federal contracts that are tied in with that, and, in my opinion, a complete abandonment of the President's Club fundraising routine.

CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. RUMSFELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include reports, articles, statements and other extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note by wire service stories today that the Johnson administration is finally at least considering a review of the military construction activities in South Vietnam, which are being handled by the consortium of U.S. firms known as RMK-BRJ. A Washington Post article of August 30, 1966, on this subject, follows my remarks. The consortium, RMK-BRJ, takes its name from the firms involved: Raymond International of New York; Morrison-Knudsen of Boise, Idaho; Brown & Root of Houston, Tex.; and J. A. Jones Construction Co. of Charlotte, N.C. Certainly, there is ample evidence that such a review is long overdue.

Last week a syndicated column by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson discussed the President's Club and the construction firm known as Brown & Root. The column concerned recent disclosures of sizable contributions to the President's Club by Mr. Brown and his family, and the firm which holds large Government contracts under the Johnson administration.

Messrs. Pearson and Anderson brought to the attention of their readers the 30-year association, personal and political, between Lyndon B. Johnson as Congressman, Senator, Vice President, and President, and the large engineering contractors, Brown & Root, Inc., of Houston, Tex., to which I referred on August 18 in my statement during the House debate on Project Mohole.

On that occasion—August 18, 1966, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 19059-19061—I pointed out that family members of Mr. George R. Brown, board chairman of Brown & Root, Inc., had contributed \$23,000 to the President's Club while the Congress was considering whether or not to continue the Mohole project with an annual appropriation of \$19.7 million.

I agree with Messrs. Pearson and Anderson when they conclude that this and other recent disclosures about the mysterious "President's Club" underscore the importance of passing a clean elections bill, which Republicans in the House are ready and eager to do.

However, Messrs. Pearson and Anderson missed a part of my statement when they assert that I "missed half the political story" by not mentioning the Department of Defense contracts for Vietnam in which Brown & Root is a principal participant. I was well aware, and so stated August 18, that Brown & Root is one of the four big U.S. contractors in Vietnam, and that Mohole was "hardly one of Brown & Root's major jobs."

On August 22, Mr. George R. Brown was quoted by the Washington Post as saying that—

Mohole is little more than a drop in the Brown & Root bucket.

The present dimensions of the "Brown & Root bucket" cannot be precisely measured without public revelation of the joint venture agreement by which the four contractors cut up what Pearson and Anderson call a \$1 million-per-day construction contract in South Vietnam.

Under only one contract, between the U.S. Government and this combine, consisting of Raymond International of Delaware, Inc., Morrison-Knudsen Co. of Asia, Inc., Brown & Root, Inc., and J. A. Jones Construction Co., all doing business as RMK-BRJ, it is officially estimated that obligations will reach at least \$900 million by November 1967. On June 30, 1966, the contract reached an obligation level of \$723 million, according to GAO. This contract includes such Vietnam construction projects as air bases, port facilities, cantonments, and logistical and administrative facilities for U.S. military forces; U.S.-furnished military facilities for the Vietnamese armed forces; AID-provided facilities for the Vietnamese; and U.S. Embassy construction. This contract began in 1962 for \$15.3 million. It has grown fast.

This contract, known as NBY-44105, first came to my attention as a result of an investigation by the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee on which I serve. Our subcommittee began looking into Vietnam operations late in 1965. A report should soon be completed on the subcommittee findings as a result of a staff study, extensive hearings, and an on-the-spot investigation by the subcommittee in Vietnam last May.

Following my remarks are portions of the July 1966 GAO report on this contract.

The Comptroller General of the United States reported to the Congress and to our subcommittee last month that the massive expenditure of public funds under this contract was being audited by a single Navy auditor in Vietnam between March or April 1962 and June 1964; by two Navy auditors on temporary duty from Tokyo between June 1964 and September 1965; and by DCAA auditors on temporary duty from October 1965 to January 1966. At that point, when our subcommittee and GAO became interested, the Saigon DCAA resident staff was beefed up to a grand total of six USAF officers and one Army enlisted clerk. At the contractor's headquarters in San Bruno, Calif., there were only two civilian auditors as of last April, according to the Comptroller Gen-

into this was made; and, secondly, it was stated that we did not have ample time because this came at the period of time when we were engaged in the civil rights debate and this was delayed pending the successful action on the civil rights debate. We were not able to get the Members of the other party on the committee together, although we tried to do so, but the Democrat-controlled committee was totally incapable of answering the questions which we wanted answered. We wanted to have appear before the committee the chairman of the Democratic committee and the chairman of the Republican committee and we wanted questions answered with reference to how to control the President's Club. We were not able to get the national chairman of the Democratic committee, Mr. Bailey, or anyone else who could give the answers to come before our committee and get these answers in the record on a bill which had been introduced by Mr. LIPSCOMB. We urged that we continue holding hearings on the matter.

Mr. CURTIS. But the committee, as I understand it, declines to look into this matter of questionable campaign financing. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GOODELL. I would say this is perhaps too strong language as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], the chairman, has indicated support for having witnesses come in and answer questions with reference to these problems. We have been unable to get this accomplished as yet, but I am still hopeful that we can get it accomplished.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for undertaking this work as an individual Member of Congress, but I do feel very strongly that the appropriate congressional committees consider the matter in the light of the information that has already been adduced. The Congress has been quite derelict in its responsibilities in failing to look into these matters. The best way to operate on anything where suspicions like these are created, and where there seems to be foundation for them, is to look into them fully and clean them up. Open them up where the light and fresh air is.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point which I would like to make. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and as a senior Republican member of that committee who often has to meet in conference with the Senate Finance Committee, we had a bill in conference earlier this year under consideration on which the other body placed an amendment which was offered by Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, to clear up what he felt was an abuse of campaign financing; namely, the use of paid advertising in political publications. After considerable discussion of the matter in conference it was agreed to. I had argued that this method of raising financing, though in need of correction, was certainly less harmful and devious than many other methods of which we all were aware. At least it was out in the open so everyone could see it.

It is much preferable to some of the ways I understand in which campaigns

are financed, certainly it is preferable to devices like the President's fund.

Nonetheless, the amendment prevailed and the Congress voted for it and the President signed the bill.

In this conference, the Secretary of the Treasury was present and he assured the conferees that the Treasury Department would come before the Congress or the appropriate committees with recommendations on how we should set up our tax laws in respect to the treatment of political campaign contributions.

To this day I am unaware in spite of this promise that there has been any followthrough in this important area.

So I again say that the gentleman is pointing out an area of grave error as a method of raising campaign funds.

Now the President of the United States can clear this up in a minute if he wants to say, "Well, I thought the President's fund was a way of raising campaign funds properly, and I certainly did not expect it to be used in an improper way. But inasmuch as this suspicion has grown up around it and it does look like there are examples of"—if he wants to use the word "misunderstanding"—"in order to clear up the misunderstanding—let us abolish it." This is an ill-conceived method of raising finances for any political party.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for his comments. May I just say that the gentleman is absolutely right when he refers to the difficulty in opening matters of this nature up on individual investigations. What is needed here is an official committee that will call in the people involved and put them under oath where they are unable to defer questioning by simply saying, "No comment." Or make a general denial that there was any connection. When you get into the details of where they were at such and such a time and what contacts they have had with certain people and whether they made out a check in this form or that form, under oath, then you can begin to bring the truth out in this matter fully where all the people can see it.

We have developed enough information where we are very sure there are serious problems and serious misuses with reference to the President's Club misuse of power and implied power.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I could not agree with the gentleman more in his pointing out that there is only one effective way of going about these kinds of investigations, by calling witnesses under oath. I might refer to one of the recommendations, I would say the major recommendation, of the Republican House members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, which was to create an investigatory committee to be under the control of the party not in control of either the Congress or the White House—because it would be asking really too much of those in the same political part to investigate each other.

In our minority views—or our supple-

mental views, because they were not minority views, we agreed with the basic recommendations of the committee—but in our supplemental views recommending the creation of this committee we pointed out that this is not new in political science. The House of Commons has for years had a committee under the control of the loyal opposition to investigate for this purpose. We also pointed out that in the 1920's when our party, the Republican Party, had the unfortunate experience of having faithless public servants in it; namely, those involved in the Teapot Dome matter, the Congress was under the control of the Republican Party in both the House and the Senate and the Executive Office was in the control of the Republican Party.

The Republicans in the Senate, to their everlasting credit, created a committee and named a Democrat, Senator Walsh, to head it to investigate the matter. It was fully investigated. That is one reason we remember the Teapot Dome. However, regrettably, we do not remember so well that because of the prompt and full investigation the U.S. Government lost not a cent as a result of this corruption.

The faithful U.S. Government officials achieved greater honor and the people had greater trust in their Government because of it.

The Democratic leaders of both the House and the Senate, and the Democratic administration under President Johnson have been covering up instead of cleaning up ever since they have been in office. I think it is about time, in fact I am thankful that others than Republicans and including some Democrats are asking that there be an end to the cover-up and that there be a general cleanup.

This is not a Republican issue. It is true that the press, or at least some of the press seem to be desirous of assisting the administration by saying, "Oh, this is just a matter of the Republicans raising Cain on a partisan basis."

Believe me, this issue is much deeper. I call upon all the right thinking Americans to take this off the Republican Party's back and get behind the move to clean up the suspicions which have developed around the administration here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman and also the proposal to which he referred made by our minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD]. I would be very pleased to adopt it in a reorganization act. I would say that I cannot think of anything that would be more salutary to restore confidence to the American people in their Government than having an investigatory body in charge of the opposition party where they can truly investigate these matters and bring out the truth.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I would like to underscore one small thought that was implied or stated by the gentleman from Missouri, and that

eral's report. An excerpt from the Comptroller General's statement before our subcommittee follows my remarks.

The GAO reports that only about \$30 million of claimed cost reimbursements in Vietnam actually had been subjected to audit, of which \$72,593 had been disallowed or suspended in Saigon subject to review by higher authority in the United States.

An additional \$173.9 million of claims had been filed in California by April 5, 1966, and on the basis of \$14,544 in disapproved items, the auditors informally held up payment until the contractors submitted additional supporting data.

This contract, NBY-44105, awarded to RMK-BRJ, is unique. It is called a "cost plus award fee contract" since May 1, 1966. I know of no similar contract, have never heard of a "cost plus award fee contract," and know of no one else who has ever heard of such a contract.

It is claimed that it is based on cost plus a fee—the fee to be based on, one, the scope of the contract, two, the project's estimated cost, and three, the estimated construction time.

For obvious and valid reasons, "cost plus percent of cost contracts" are illegal by statute and are not used by the U.S. Government. This contract looks like a "cost plus percent of cost" contract, it sounds like a "cost plus percent of cost" contract, and it apparently works almost like a "cost plus percent of cost" contract. But, interestingly, it is called, euphemistically and somewhat mysteriously—and it is, to my knowledge, the only one so called—a "cost plus award fee" contract. Who says you cannot turn a sow's ear into a silk purse.

Why this huge contract has not been and is not now being adequately audited is beyond me. The potential for waste and profiteering under such a contract is substantial. The attached article from the New York Times of August 29, 1966, points up this problem.

In recent wars, such facilities as air-bases, port facilities, cantonments, and so forth, have mainly been built by military personnel, such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the redoubtable U.S. Navy Seabees.

I have not researched the history books to know positively as Messrs. Pearson and Anderson say, that "for the first time in the history of modern warfare the basic work has been turned over to private contractors, a consortium of four companies, including Brown & Root."

But this is clearly a momentous shift in U.S. defense policy, and if one is to judge by President Johnson's remarks to the press only last Wednesday, it is likely to go long after the war is over.

Mr. Johnson, on that occasion, said: I have even asked that we give thought to planning how we could convert these bases to useful civilian purposes and we are giving study to that now.

Mr. George R. Brown, longtime personal and political friend of President Johnson and a prime mover in the Houston cell of the President's Club, is certainly correct in claiming that "Mohole is little more than a drop in the Brown & Root bucket."

The capacity of the Brown & Root bucket is certainly vast, even by Texas standards. And it may prove to be bottomless as well.

It has been suggested that the \$23,000 in Brown family contributions to the President's Club is only the latest installment in their dealings with Mr. Johnson.

But if these Texas ties explain the Brown family's generosity, how does one explain the \$12,000 in President's Club contributions reported by Messrs. Evans and Novak from the family and associates of businessman J. Edward Martin, a former Republican Party official in California.

The continuing revelations of "coincidences" which attract the most unlikely business and political bedfellows to the privacy and intimacy of the President's Club, certainly would suggest to all but the most innocent mind that the President's Club is where the action is.

As stated in a New York Times editorial of August 29, 1966, which I will append following my remarks, "the concern is not narrowly partisan."

Only a full investigation of the President's Club and any possible connection with Government contracts can supply the answers to the questions raised. Only prompt passage of election reform legislation can help to avoid such concern in the future. And, only adoption of the recommendation of the minority members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to create an investigating committee to be controlled by the minority, can assure vigorous investigation and public airing of similar coincidences. The House of Commons in Great Britain has such a committee controlled by the minority. A Republican administration and a Republican Congress appointed a Democratic Senator to investigate the Teapot Dome scandal. It is not a new idea—it is a sound and necessary one.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 30, 1966]

U.S. MILITARY EXPECTED TO ASSUME VIETNAM CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
(By John Maffre)

By early next year, military construction units may have assumed the lion's share of a massive building program in South Vietnam that is now being handled by a consortium of four U.S. firms.

It depends largely on how quickly the Defense Department can reinforce the 15 Army Engineer and eight Navy Seabee construction battalions there, so the military can take over more of the \$800 million program whose rising costs have raised congressional eyebrows.

Yesterday the Pentagon at first said there had been no curtailment of the existing program, but later modified this to say no curtailment "was expected" as it is being re-studied. It acknowledged that some of the contingency funds which the consortium needed to carry on the program have not yet been committed.

As a result, the consortium known as "RMK-BRJ"—believed to be the largest building combine in history—has complained in Saigon that it has begun to lay off thousands of Vietnamese and other workers, and to sell excess building materials and earth-moving equipment.

The consortium takes its name from the firms involved. Raymond International of

New York; Morrison-Knudsen of Boise, Idaho; Brown & Root of Houston; and J. A. Jones Construction Co. of Charlotte, N.C.

In New York an official of Raymond International said:

"We took a beating in the stock market today because of this."

He said Raymond had completed \$38 million of construction in the first six months of the year, had a \$76 million backlog of work for the same period and also had \$69 million in new work ordered in that period. Its Vietnam commitment is equal to about half of its entire domestic and other foreign business combined.

The Pentagon took the position that civilian contractors "were now in a position to cut back" on their excess manpower and supplies.

From RMK-BRJ and Pentagon sources it was not immediately clear whether there had been prior understanding that the military might eventually take over much of the program.

"Our military capacity in South Vietnam is increasing," a Pentagon spokesman said yesterday, "and as it grows there will be less and less need in the future to rely on contractors for massive construction."

Another source said that part of the \$800 million earmarked for the program controlled by the Navy is set aside as a contingency fund.

Reports from Saigon say that at least \$200 million of this money has been withheld while Defense officials study the program to reassign the priorities. This may be completed in October.

Congress has recently been critical of the skyrocketing costs and the alleged waste involved in the building program in Vietnam, and some legislators claim the auditing of funds used there is inadequate.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland commanding the U.S. forces in Vietnam, is known to have urged a highest priority for the training of construction battalions for Vietnam.

SURVEYS OF INTERNAL AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS RELATING TO U.S. ACTIVITIES IN VIETNAM
(Report to the Congress of the United States by the Comptroller General of the United States, July 1966)

CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

Construction projects in Viet Nam account for a very sizable portion of the United States funds being expended in support of United States objectives in that country. The major portion of this construction is being performed under contract and the following schedule summarizes the level of this contracting as of about the beginning of March 1966.

[In millions of dollars]

	Amount
Cost-plus-award-fee contract with a joint venture for construction of air bases, port facilities, cantonments, and logistical and administrative facilities for United States and Vietnamese military forces; AID-provided medical facilities; a U.S. embassy; and other projects...	1 503.6
Fixed-price contracts (83) for architect and engineering services, principally related to the above joint venture contract.....	6.4
Fixed-price, cost-plus-fixed-fee, and cost-plus-incentive-fee contracts (4) for construction of communications facilities.....	12.0
Fixed-price contracts (223) for minor construction projects for U.S. military facilities.....	3.6
Total.....	525.6

¹ Estimated to amount to about \$900 million by November 1967.

In addition to the foregoing projects, there are at least five AID-financed, capital development projects being constructed under contracts totaling \$62.7 million. (See p. 34.)

Numerous minor construction projects are also being accomplished by engineer and construction units of United States Army and Navy commands in Viet Nam.

The atmosphere surrounding the billion dollar construction undertaking in Viet Nam and the conditions of urgency under which the work is proceeding are at best conducive to a large element of waste, some of it unavoidable. Many of the management controls which are applied in a normal construction operation are precluded by the circumstances. In our opinion, this creates a greater than ordinary need for a searching management review and inspection function on a continuing basis. Further, we believe that this is necessary to offset in some degree the lack of cost consciousness which tends to thrive under such conditions of urgency. From our survey it appears that such counterbalance is essential to reduce avoidable waste without hindering the program.

AUDITS OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

Audits related to contracts for major construction in Viet Nam have been limited to voucher audits performed, for the most part, by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) on one large cost-plus-award-fee, joint venture contract and subcontracts thereto. This contract, identified as NBY-44105, was awarded January 19, 1962, by the United States Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks (BuDocks)¹ to a joint venture which now consists of Raymond International of Delaware, Inc., Morrison-Knudsen Company of Asia, Inc., Brown and Root, Inc., and J. A. Jones Construction Company, all doing business as RMK-BRJ. As of February 28, 1966, obligations for this contract had reached about \$503.6 million and a BuDocks Resident Officer-in-Charge of Construction (ROICC) at San Bruno, California, estimated that by November 1967 costs would amount to about \$900 million. Projects to be constructed include air bases, port facilities, cantonments, and logistical and administrative facilities for United States military forces; United States-furnished military facilities for the Vietnamese Armed forces; AID-provided medical facilities for the Vietnamese; and a United States embassy.

Audit responsibility for the RMK-BRJ contract is presently being carried out by resident staffs of the DCAA in Saigon, Viet Nam, and San Bruno, California. On the basis of information provided by DCAA audit personnel in Saigon and San Bruno, the audits being conducted can be characterized, for the most part, as voucher-type audits, consisting of audits of the contractor's cost representations as shown on vouchers presented for payment. DCAA personnel stated that the voucher-type audits normally include examination of the contractor's reimbursement vouchers and supporting documents, such as requisitions, purchase orders, and receiving documents. We were advised in March 1966 by the DCAA Resident Auditor-in-Charge in Saigon that his audit staff was reviewing overhead rates and payroll costs of RMK-BRJ. We found that, at the same time, the DCAA audit staff at San Bruno was planning to make surveys of RMK-BRJ's procedures relating to travel and relocation expense, home office expense, personnel and fringe benefits for employees in Viet Nam and at San Bruno, material receiving and control functions, and internal audit functions.

The audits in Viet Nam were being accomplished by a DCAA resident staff consisting of six United States Air Force officers and one United States Army enlisted clerk

¹ Redesignated Naval Facilities Engineering Command, effective May 1, 1966.

on a 1-year permanent-duty tour. The audits at the RMK-BRJ principal office in San Bruno, California, were being accomplished, as of April 1966, by two resident civilian auditors of the DCAA. Staff personnel of the DCAA East Bay, California, Branch advised us in April 1966 that they had requested their San Francisco Regional Office to provide five additional auditors to assist in the review of contract costs at the RMK-BRJ San Bruno office.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) on June 17, 1966, advised us (see app. IX) as follows:

"Since the establishment of the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) Saigon sub-office with a staff of seven, considerable progress has been made in liquidating the audit backlog on cost-type contracts, and in developing comprehensive audit programs to replace the voucher-type audit * * *. Contract audit workload has expanded so rapidly that DCAA now plans to increase the Saigon suboffice staff to a total of 11 people. With respect to audit work at the RMK-BRJ principal office at San Bruno, California, the San Francisco office of DCAA has reassigned personnel to meet the unanticipated workload generated by requirements in Southeast Asia. To meet increased workloads in Viet Nam and Thailand, DCAA also is planning to establish a Southeast Asia Branch Office to be located in Bangkok, Thailand. That office will supervise audit work in both locations and will itself be under the constant surveillance of the San Francisco Regional Office. Staffs will be augmented further if work requirements dictate and other priority workloads permit."

The DCAA Resident Auditor-in-Charge in Saigon advised us that, prior to the establishment in January 1966 of a DCAA resident audit office in Saigon, audits of contract costs of major construction in Viet Nam were performed by one resident Navy area auditor between March or April 1962 and June 1964; by Navy area auditors on temporary-duty assignments from Tokyo between June 1964 and September 1965; and by DCAA auditors on temporary-duty assignments from October 1965 to January 1966.

Within Viet Nam, RMK-BRJ had claimed reimbursements of about \$89.4 million of costs incurred to March 1, 1966, and of these, the DCAA Resident Auditor-in-Charge estimated that about \$30 million of costs had been subjected to audit. We found that as of March 1, 1966, the auditors in Saigon had disallowed or suspended cost reimbursements of \$72,593.72; however, the DCAA Resident Auditor-in-Charge advised us that an additional \$59,525.34 of questioned costs had been submitted to the DCAA San Francisco Regional Office for final determination as to whether they should be suspended or disallowed.

In addition to the cost reimbursements claimed in Saigon, RMK-BRJ at its San Bruno office has claimed reimbursement for about \$173.9 million of costs incurred to April 5, 1966. About \$116.4 million of these claimed costs had been subjected to audit as of March 31, 1966, according to personnel of the DCAA East Bay, California, Branch. We found that as of April 5, 1966, the auditors had disapproved \$14,543.85 of the claimed costs; and, according to DCAA East Bay Branch personnel, the auditors have informally suspended the approval of an additional \$180,695.51 of claimed costs until the contractor submits additional data to support the claimed costs.

The Comptroller of the Officer-in-Charge of Construction (OICC) in Vietnam advised us in March 1966 that there were 83 fixed-price contracts amounting to about \$6.4 million for architect and engineering services in Vietnam, most of which relate directly to construction work being performed by RMK-BRJ.

United States Army Strategic Communica-

tions Command (STRATCOM) officials in Saigon advised us that there were four contracts for construction of communications facilities in Viet Nam totalling about \$12 million, consisting of two firm-fixed-price contracts, one cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, and one cost-plus-incentive-fee contract.

We were advised that there were 223 fixed-price contracts for minor construction of Army and Navy projects in Viet Nam totalling \$3.6 million. These contracts concerned construction of military facilities in Viet Nam. Forty-four of them, amounting to about \$848,000, were awarded by the 1st Logistical Command, United States Army, Viet Nam (USARV), after June 1, 1965, and 179, amounting to about \$2.76 million, were awarded by the Navy Headquarters Support Activity, Saigon (HSAS),² for work starting on or after February 19, 1965.

Except under unusual circumstances, contractor records under fixed-price contracts are not subject to audit. However, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), on June 17, 1966 (see app. IX), advised us that DCAA provides advisory assistance in connection with such contracts upon the request of contracting officers and that, in this connection, on numerous occasions reviews of proposed hourly and/or per diem rates for use in negotiating fixed-price architect and engineering contracts had been made by DCAA auditors for the various OICC's in the Southeast Asia Area. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) further advised us that, to ensure that contract audit responsibilities are being met, DCAA will explore the entire contract situation to determine whether any recognized audit responsibilities do exist with respect to the fixed-price contracts, as well as with respect to the four contracts for construction of communications facilities in Viet Nam totalling about \$12 million. (See p. 60.)

AUDITS OF CONSTRUCTION PERFORMED BY MILITARY UNITS

We were advised by responsible United States Army and Navy officials that costs of minor construction projects performed in Viet Nam by the 18th Army Engineer Brigade and the 30th Naval Construction Regiment had not been audited by cognizant audit agencies of their respective services.

STATEMENT OF ELMER B. STAATS, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT INFORMATION AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS, JULY 29, 1966

"In connection with the military construction program, totaling nearly \$600 million up to March 1966, \$504 million had been incurred under a single joint-venture contract for construction of air bases, port facilities, cantonments, and logistical and administrative facilities for United States and Vietnamese military forces, and other projects. Audit to date by the defense agencies having responsibility have been limited mostly to examination of the contractors' cost representations as shown on vouchers presented for payment. Insofar as we could determine, no management reviews or evaluations have been undertaken of substantive contract performance or of the broader control aspects of the construction program.

"The atmosphere surrounding the billion-dollar construction undertaking in Viet Nam and the conditions of urgency under which the work is proceeding are at best conducive to a large element of waste, some of it unavoidable. Many of the management controls which are applied in a normal construction operation are precluded by the

² Redesignated United States Naval Forces, Viet Nam (NAVFORV), effective April 1, 1966.

August 30, 1966

circumstances. In our opinion, this creates an urgent need for a counterbalance in the form of a searching management review and inspection function on a continuing basis to reduce avoidable waste without hindering the program. There appears to be a particular need for audits and inspections concerning the adequacy and timeliness of delivery, the end use, and the propriety of costs of the large amounts of equipment, spare parts, and supplies that are being provided under the program.

"We found no audits being conducted nor did we find any current plans by the audit agencies of the Department of the Army and Navy to perform audits of military supply or logistics activity other than construction in Viet Nam. The Air Force Auditor General was planning some audit by temporary duty staff in the areas of accounting and finance, procurement, and nonappropriated funds. However, Army and Air Force audit agencies were performing extensive audits at Pacific bases and in the United States of activities relating to logistic support of the military effort in Viet Nam. Audits conducted by the military commands in Viet Nam have been limited mostly to nonappropriated fund activities such as officers' and enlisted men's clubs and open messes."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1966]
VIETNAM BUILDING CURTAILED BY UNITED STATES—PENTAGON DECIDES TO REVIEW PROGRAM OF CONSORTIUM

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, August 28.—Washington has applied the brakes, at least temporarily, to the gigantic American military and civilian building program in South Vietnam.

The consortium of four American construction companies responsible for the program has begun to pare its payroll, and it will soon begin to sell excess equipment and materials, including lumber and bulldozers. During August and September 7,000 workers will be laid off, cutting the total to 45,000.

Almost every commercial flight leaving Saigon's Tansonnhat Airport is crowded with construction men heading home.

Behind the slowdown, according to unimpeachable sources, lies a Defense Department decision to re-evaluate the building program. While the Pentagon makes up its mind what to do next, a process expected to last at least until October, less money is available than the consortium had expected.

SOME FUNDS HELD UP

About \$800-million has been allocated for the building of a complex of piers, airfields, cantonments and other facilities in Vietnam, but only \$600-million has been appropriated. It is now uncertain when, if ever, the other \$200-million will be made available.

Bertram L. Perkins, the resident chief of the consortium, said all the projects now under way could be completed without the \$200-million, but only by stretching out the work over many years. Other projects on the drawing boards would have to be canceled, the executive said. The companies he serves are Raymond International of New York, Morrison-Knudsen of Boise, Idaho, Brown & Root of Houston and J. A. Jones Construction Company of Charlotte, N.C.

Mr. Perkins said he thought the Pentagon would eventually commit "considerably more" than \$200-million in new funds to the Vietnam effort. If that happened, he said with a rueful smile, it might be necessary to rehire many of the employees now being furloughed.

FACTORS IN DECISION

Among the factors apparently involved in the Defense Department's unannounced plan to take a second look at the huge effort are the following:

Allegations of waste by Congressional critics, including the House Government

Operations subcommittee. Some American critics of the consortium have asserted that it has lost or wasted as much as \$125-million worth of materials.

A Pentagon decision to assign projects for which the consortium had tooled up to other civilian or military builders.

A need to re-evaluate the program's impact on South Vietnam's economy and manpower reserves, and to decide whether a "follow-on" program will be needed once the priority projects have been completed.

In consortium has been involved in several controversies with the American command here, including one over the right of its employees to use post exchanges. It is unclear whether these disputes, which have embittered a number of key generals, were an element in the decision to slow down the program.

LAYOFFS TO EXCEED 7,000

Mr. Perkins, a tall, blond, 44-year-old Californian, said in an interview that the layoffs would affect 5,500 South Vietnamese, 1,000 Americans and 550 South Koreans and Filipinos, mostly foremen and skilled craftsmen.

He expressed pride in the job his men had done in Vietnam and ill-concealed irritation at the Pentagon.

"Building \$800-million worth of airfields and docks in wartime on a crash schedule is not like building the Empire State Building," he said. "I won't be naive enough to deny that this kind of thing produces some waste.

"Until the end of July they were raising hell with us to speed up, hire more people, build faster and faster. Then the First of August came and they said there wasn't enough money. We did what they asked. Now they're unhappy."

The executive conceded that at times the consortium had "recruited people with a butterfly net." He said it had had to be less selective than usual because of the pressure for speed.

MONTHLY GOAL \$40 MILLION

Late last year the Pentagon set a goal for the consortium: By October it was to have enough men and equipment on hand to handle \$40-million in construction a month. It hired thousands of new workers, and by late last month the rate had reached \$39.6-million.

Mr. Perkins and the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, which oversees the consortium's work, agreed that the goal would have been met if the cutback had not been ordered.

"For a lot of reasons," a Navy spokesman said, "the \$40-million figure isn't magic any more. Now what we want is to trim out some of the fat. The emphasis now is on efficiency, not on speed."

The consortium is at work on 37 major projects, including port facilities at Camranh Bay, 180 miles east of Saigon; a second runway for the air base at Danang, a new United States Embassy in Saigon and a new "military city" north of here that will house American troops.

The capacities of the consortium are awesome; it has enough equipment in Vietnam to excavate almost 11 million cubic yards of earth a month and to put down 400,000 cubic yards of concrete a month.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S CLUB

President Johnson's comment that Republicans are responsible for renewed public uneasiness over the President's Club, that financially elite group whose members contribute \$1,000 or more to the Democratic party in exchange for undefined but special access to the President of the United States, is not likely to set many minds at rest. It now appears that there is a super-elite group made up of persons who raise or contribute \$10,000 each.

Partisan critics have called attention to the fact that a wealthy St. Louis brewer and members of his family made large donations to the President's Club last spring while an antitrust suit against the brewery was being settled by the Justice Department. The contractor on Project Mohole, the controversial and now abandoned attempt to drill below the earth's crust, has also been criticized for his recent contribution to the club. In both instances, Government agencies deny favoritism.

But it remains true that certain businessmen who have no natural loyalty to the Democratic party or to the President's program, among them some Goldwater Republicans and members of the John Birch Society, have joined this club. Its very existence poses an irresistible temptation for certain businessmen who are now or have in the past been in trouble with the law to try to buy the appearance, if not the fact, of official influence.

President Johnson has now coupled a denial that membership in the President's Club affects the award of Government contracts with his charge that most of the current criticism is just Republican electioneering. But the concern is not narrowly partisan. Basically, it derives from respect for Mr. Johnson's name and office. Both are placed in needless jeopardy by a political fund-raising operation that provides a nexus for influence-seekers and carries the constant risk of scandal.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution to this colloquy and for laying out on the RECORD some of these points. I also appreciate his support for this idea of an investigatory committee of the Congress under the control of the loyal opposition.

Looking into the future, I hope that when we Republicans again control the White House and the Congress, if this has not been accomplished, we will demonstrate that it is basically sound and extend this kind of operation to our Democratic colleagues.

I wanted to ask a couple of questions about this cost-plus contract. I assume it was negotiated, and not an advertised bid.

Mr. RUMSFELD. It is my understanding it was not an advertised bid, that it was a negotiated contract. It was first discussed in late 1961. It was actually formalized in 1962. It was revised, I believe, in May of 1966 when one or two additional members were brought in.

Mr. CURTIS. For the past 6 years—I believe it is 6 years—the Joint Economic Committee has had a Subcommittee on Government Procurement looking at the broad aspects of Government contracts and the effect of Government contracting on the civilian sector of our society. One of the things we have looked into over a period or years, which we continue to look into, is the technique of contracting. The gentleman is entirely correct in his reference that the cost-plus-percent-of-cost contract is contrary to law.

I cannot for the life of me see how this particular contract could be classified in any other category. Could I ask, did the General Accounting Office comment on this aspect as to whether this was a

August 30, 1966

violation of the law against cost-plus contracts?

Mr. RUMSFELD. The General Accounting Office in its report did not comment as to whether or not it was in fact a cost-plus-percent-of-cost contract and, therefore, illegal under the statutes. They described it as a cost-plus-award fee contract, which is the label that was put on it by the Department of Defense and the GAO apparently took it at its face value for that. My own investigation led to the information that it is based on cost plus a percent of those three factors that I mentioned; namely, the scope of the job, the time involved, and the estimated cost.

Mr. CURTIS. It sounds to me, and I am just anticipating what the Department of Defense might say, and maybe the gentleman could elucidate on this point, that this was necessary because of emergency. Have they said anything like that?

Mr. RUMSFELD. There is no question but what the statements by representatives of the agencies of the Government operating in Vietnam have repeatedly during the investigation of our subcommittee of various agencies such as the AID, the USIA, and the DOD, brought forth the very real fact that there is a war going on and that they have had escalations. It has obviously been an escalation when you think that this contract started out as a \$15.3 million contract in 1962, and now is up over \$700 million.

Mr. CURTIS. There has been escalation, but it would not necessarily mean you had to do your contracting on a crash basis. The administration has maintained, and I have defended them on this point, or at least I thought the facts justified their statement—they have maintained that the cost of the Vietnam war is such a small percentage relatively of the gross national product of the society of the United States that crash programs have not been necessary. I have tried to point this out from time to time to some of my Republican colleagues who I think were getting a little overenthusiastic as to whether or not this was not showing the pinch here and there.

But as near as I can figure out there has been no justification for crash programs, that is, following procurement practices out of the ordinary because there has not been sufficient time to plan. Surely there has to be acceleration, but has that acceleration been to the point where you can use the term "crash program"? In other words, to set aside what everyone would recognize to be proper and careful procurement practices because of the emergency. This can happen. What I am leading up to is this: Earlier this year we had on the floor of the House an extension of the Renegotiation Act which I opposed for these very reasons that I am expressing here. I said the development of the military defense departments' techniques for letting procurement practices had been well developed in the ensuing years, and I gave them a high grade, I may say, for the development of these methods.

Therefore, there was not a need for the Renegotiation Board which solely dealt

with crash programs. We will see now we have something for the Renegotiation Board to do. They can start looking into this contract over in Vietnam, and possibly a few others that obviously, it seems to me, have been let on a crash basis. Perhaps we can get some of this money back, possibly including whatever might have been given to the President's fund.

I want to commend the gentleman for the careful work that I have observed he has done in respect to Mohole, which came out of another committee on which the gentleman serves, as I understand it. What he is now reporting to us comes as a result of his work on the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

Now, where are the Democrats on those committees who have a responsibility to the House to follow through on these questions and not put the burden on the minority party as if, and the conclusion might be made that, this is a partisan effort. Where are they in helping to clean this up?

I ask that because if there are proper explanations, then for Heaven's sakes let us have them, because the names of many people are involved in this. And, if these people are innocent and this is really the result of unusual circumstances, it can be explained.

Mr. Speaker, their reputations deserve to be cleared, and there is only one way to do this. That is for a bipartisan approach in order to get into this thing and start calling a few witnesses before the committees under subpoena power.

Mr. Speaker, just as I said with reference to my comments during the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODSELL], this is not and should not be placed as a burden upon the Republican Party. This is something that the Democrats are equally interested in, I am sure, certainly independent people and certainly the news media in general.

Many of them have been active in this area, but I believe this needs a great deal of basic and strong support that will get this off the back of the Republican Party and Republican Members and individual Members such as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD], because the welfare of the country is at stake. This problem needs this kind of treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman again. I hope that this little exercise here—although the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] commented that only a few Members are present and here it is 10 minutes after 3 o'clock and it is understandable why they are not present. But this RECORD will be made up for anyone in this country to read tomorrow and I hope attention is paid to it.

Mr. Speaker, let me finally say that if the Democratic leaders of this country in this House and in the White House choose not to clean up this matter then, indeed, this is an election issue for every American to think about, and believe me I shall do everything I can to campaign on this basis.

But, Mr. Speaker, I plead with the

Democrat leaders to not make this a partisan issue. Corruption or alleged corruption has been referred to but it has not been proven. These are suspicions and so forth. This should be placed upon a bipartisan basis. It is something in which all of us are interested and I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his contribution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. First, I would certainly commend the gentleman in the well, as a member of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information of the Committee on Government Operations, for his very diligent efforts and in connection with and in line with what the gentleman from Missouri stated.

We are talking about contract obligations that approach \$1 billion. Mr. Speaker, it is almost inconceivable to think that for a period of almost 2 years, from March 1962 until October 1964, these contracts were being audited by a single Navy auditor. Certainly, it smacks of what at least suggests not only waste but possible war profiteering.

I certainly feel that it should be investigated, as has been stated, by a bipartisan committee, because we are talking, as I said earlier, about contract obligations approaching \$1 billion.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if there is any evidence at all of undue waste or of any war profiteering, then it should be made a matter of record.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his very fine statement.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

OCEANOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, our dramatic progress toward conquering the frontiers of space has stolen some of the headlines from another frontier much closer to home, but, in many ways, posing as many unknowns, as much reward and even as much glamour as our breakthroughs toward the stars.

This neglected, if not forgotten, frontier lies beneath the surface of the oceans which cover so much of our own planet.

Too often, we forget that basically we are an island people. Oceans virtually surround our country. They determine our military strategies, our national interests in resource development, and characterize our modes of communication and transportation.

National security is tied to our ability to exploit and manipulate the sea environment. The Polaris missile submarine was made possible by our ability to successfully place this complex weapon system in an alien environment—not the

When a car strikes something solid enough, it stops dead—the “first collision.” Then, following an inexorable law of physics, the people inside the car continue on with undiminished speed until they fetch up against something solid enough to stop them—windshield, dash or steering column. That is the “second collision.”

The auto safety hearings, which produced a bill passed recently by overwhelming margins in both the Senate and the House, was concerned primarily with the “second collision,” and making the interiors of cars less deadly for flying humans.

It is too bad that the auto safety bill got all the publicity, because trailing along in its shadow was a second bill—the highway safety act—that is designed indeed to cut down the number of accidents, not soften their impact. Without a “first collision,” the “second collision” can’t happen. Despite extravagant claims made for padded dashes and collapsible steering columns, the real potential for lifesaving lies in the highway safety act (which, like the auto safety act, has passed both houses and is certain of presidential approval).

The act will allow the Secretary of Commerce to set minimum standards for, among other things, driver education and licensing, vehicle inspections, traffic control and highway design. The states, which now have conflicting standards—or none at all—in these fields, will get federal grants to help modernize. And, if they don’t agree to shape up, they face the loss of 10 percent of their federal highway funds.

Stricter standards in every field of highway safety are proven lifesavers and—in most states—long overdue. Take the case for better highway lighting, for which the Secretary of Commerce would be empowered to set standards:

In Chicago, a well-lighted stretch of expressway has a death rate only one third the average on all American expressways.

In Indianapolis, auto fatalities dropped by 54 percent after a new lighting system was installed.

In Virginia, improved lighting at nine “high-accident locations” cut accidents by 38 percent and fatalities by 90 percent.

Proper lighting adds less than one percent to the cost of a new highway, yet much of our new expressway network, and many older roads, are far too dark. The case for some prompt action on new lighting and other standards seems clear.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record an article from the Chicago Tribune of August 19, 1966, concerning Chicago’s plan for installing lights in the alleys of Chicago.

ERECT ALLEY LIGHTS OCTOBER 1—BONDS TO PAY \$10.5 MILLION PROJECT COST—FIRST MAJOR CITY TO INSTALL THEM

Installation of 51,000 mercury vapor lights in 2,300 miles of Chicago alleys is scheduled to begin Oct. 1, Mayor Daley announced yesterday.

Advertising for bids on a contract to supply and install the lights will begin today, and the bids will be opened Sept. 2. Installation of the lights, mostly on existing poles, is scheduled for completion early next year.

PART OF \$195 MILLION

This will be the initial use of funds from 195 million dollars of bond issues authorized by voters last June 14. The alleys will be lighted with 10.5 million dollars from a 20 million dollar issue for street and alley lighting.

Bids will be opened next Thursday on 25 million dollars of bonds, including the 10.5 million of bonds for the alley lighting. If a satisfactory offer for the bonds is received, the city council is expected to approve the bond sale the same day.

Normally bonds are sold before advertising begins on contracts to be financed by the bond money.

Daley said Chicago will become the first major city to provide lighting in all its alleys, tho some smaller cities have done so. He said the lights will reduce crime and accidents, and also will be of convenience to residents.

The top priority in the installations will go to areas with high crime rates, Daley said.

AUTOMATIC TURNOFF

The specifications provide that each light shall be equipped with electric eye, which will turn it on as darkness approaches and turn it off at sun-up.

Existing utility poles will be used where they are available. Engineers are making a survey to determine how many additional poles must be erected.

Daley said plans and specifications are being prepared for installation of 1,800 street lights in areas which have none and 3,800 additional lights on approaches to arterial streets. He said bids will be sought on these contracts in the near future.

VN

ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as the day for elections in South Vietnam draws closer and we read about the preparations that are being made, I would like to reiterate my desire that all possible efforts be taken to return to a civilian form of government in that country.

I do not know what the outcome of the elections will be, and I could wish that voting was not restricted only to those who agree with the policies of the present military regime, but I cling to the hope that constructive steps will result from the elections.

I am also sorry to note that there will not be supervision of these elections by an international body such as the ICC or the United Nations. I joined with a number of my colleagues in introducing a House concurrent resolution which called for an expression of interest by the Congress in having supervision by an impartial international agency such as the United Nations. These were introduced in June and I know of no action that has been taken by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on any of the resolutions.

Even before that, on May 12, 1966, I wrote to the President asking that he make the same request of the United Nations. I have unanimous consent that the House concurrent resolution, my letter to the President, and the reply I received, be printed at this point in the Record:

The Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During this period in which you are reported to be considering anew the problems of Vietnam policy, may I respectfully urge upon you the importance of a firm and unequivocal commitment to abide by the will of the Vietnamese people, expressed through a civilian government, freely and honestly elected at an early date, to aid in finding the proper solutions to the war in Vietnam.

The public is becoming more and more aware that our involvement in Vietnam can be traced directly to clandestine arrangements, at least in part, contrary to the publicly expressed policy of this country. Whatever may have been the rationale for such arrangements at the time, the course of events has cast serious doubts upon their wisdom. Would you, Mr. President, have approved the steps taken by this government in the post-Geneva period if you had known what you know now about the cost in Vietnamese and American lives and dollars?

You have expressed your commitment to abide by the will of the Vietnamese people expressed in free elections. Similar commitments were made in 1954 when we said,

“In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly.”

And in 1955, when Eisenhower said with regard to Germany:

“The division of Germany cannot be supported by any argument based on boundaries or language or racial origin. The domination of captive countries cannot longer be justified by any claim that this is needed for purposes of security.”

A public commitment must be vigorously supported by public and private action. Our commitment to seek and abide by the will of the people of South Vietnam has not been so supported—for reasons all too obvious. The Generals of South Vietnam clearly fear the election of a popular civilian government. Our own military and diplomatic leaders undoubtedly fear the results of the election of a civilian government. The possibility exists that such a government will seek to settle the war on terms different from those we have offered. Such a settlement might be embarrassing to those whose judgments, and advice to you, has pointed in other directions.

Yet if there has been one firm principle underlying the commitments made by three Presidents to the people of South Vietnam, it is the principle that our aid and support is to secure the freedom of the people of South Vietnam to control their own destiny.

I feel very strongly that the tragic course of Vietnamese history can only be altered by your firm support and assistance to the forces seeking an honestly elected civilian government at the earliest possible date. The cause of peace throughout the world would be enhanced by such a stand on your part, and even more enhanced by a request from you for U.N. observers to assist in guaranteeing the honesty of the elections.

Mr. President, the course of history can sometimes be critically affected by one great act of statesmanship. This is the time and the place for such an act on your part.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 13, 1966.

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 12 to the President regarding the question of free elections in Vietnam, and urging that the United Nations be asked to supervise them.

Your comments and recommendations will have most careful consideration by the President and his advisers.

Sincerely,

HENRY H. WILSON, Jr.,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

H. CON. RES. 810

Whereas the Republic of South Vietnam is actively engaged in making preparations for

void of space, but our own underwater world.

The seas contain many not-so-well-hidden treasures in the form of minerals and food. Many metals are presently mined from the ocean. The petroleum industry, with the aid of constantly improved techniques, is probing the Continental Shelf for the plentiful supplies of black gold. Fish, another resource of the sea, is vital to the world food supply.

The exploration of the sea, the exploitation of its resources, the unraveling of some of its mysteries, and the understanding of some of its strange, and perhaps intelligent inhabitants might hold the answers to world problems far beyond the obvious industrial and military ones. For example, who has not imagined cities of men under great space domes dotting the surface of the moon. But some scientists tell us that the day may come when such cities will dot the floors of our oceans.

We are learning that the dolphin, for example, has a brain case as great as that of man. Studies of this remarkable sea mammal indicate that it does have considerable intelligence and that dolphins actually may communicate with each other. It may very well be that before we meet any beings from outer space, we may be talking to fish.

However, our approach to oceanography, the science of the sea, has been something less than satisfactory.

New knowledge that is gained is not readily tied to practical application. Pure old-fashioned geographical exploration in the spirit of Lewis and Clark is ignored. Resource development and utilization has been too slow. The resources of the sea are virtually untapped. We must face the problem that oceanography today lacks unity of purpose and coordination.

Since 1959 with the release of the National Academy of Science's key report, "Oceanography 1960 to 1970," Congress has taken a keen interest in the problem. I am hopeful, therefore, that the stage will soon be set for new and perhaps amazing breakthroughs in our neighboring world of water.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the legislation which is pending before the House to establish a new Cabinet-level agency, that of the Department of Transportation.

I believe that this legislation will go a long way in contributing a great deal toward the modernizing and the upgrading of our transportation systems. It should help immeasurably the public transportation systems, especially the railroads who are experiencing the lowest point in their transportation efforts.

In my judgment, this legislation which will create a single agency and offer a unified view of the entire transportation field, be it air, water, road or rail, will

permit us to look at it from the vantage point of a single agency, rather than that of several separate agencies or departments.

As a Member of Congress from an Eastern State, I am concerned with the rising population of our coastal cities and the lack of expansion of transportation to meet the demands of this rise in population. I can see that, in the near future, improvement in air and ground transportation for the movement of these people will be very necessary. I can see that truck transportation will have to be expanded to meet the needs of these people in obtaining their every day supplies of their livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation seems to have the united support of this body, except for one item which is proposed to be included in this new Transportation Department—that of the merchant marine.

I cannot agree that the problems of the merchant marine should be included in this proposed new agency. I endorse the concept of an independent Maritime Administration, one that will be free from control by any overall Government department.

The principal reason for my position of the matter of the merchant marine is that it is not, like the other forms of transportation, a form of domestic transit. The functions of the merchant marine is in the field of foreign commerce. Navigation on the high seas, and its function and activity is, overwhelmingly, conducted outside the jurisdiction of the United States.

The ships and crews of the merchant marine are normally on the high seas, more often in foreign ports than in American ports. Thus one can see that their problems are vastly different than that of the crews and equipment of the airlines, the trucking industry, the railroads, even that of the Coast Guard.

We have gone far enough in neglecting America's seapower to where we are now classed as a third-rate status and we should make such endeavors as we possibly can to reverse this trend through an upgrading of the agency which oversees the functions of the merchant marine.

The American merchant marine, the finest in the world after World War II, has fallen to the bottom rung of the ladder among maritime nations. This is the result of shortsighted policies of our government officials who did not, or did not wish to understand the significance of commercial seapower.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we are all agreed that this downward slide should not continue. The quality and strength of our merchant marine is an important factor in the defense of our Nation. I believe in the merchant marine and, today, it is being called upon to meet a war situation for the third time in 25 years. We have reactivated many merchant ships during the present Vietnam conflict and, even with these reactivated ships we have only about 1,000 ships in that category. This is a far cry from the over 3,500 ships which we had after the close of World War II.

Our shipbuilding endeavors have drop-

ped the United States as a major shipbuilding nation, while the Russian efforts have raised that country to a place above us. Our shipbuilding capacity should be increased and this action should not be controlled by an agency which would be an overall overseer of our transportation problems. This demand for additional merchant marine expansion should be installed within an independent agency—the Maritime Administration.

The inclusion of the merchant marine activities under the proposed Transportation Department would be a disservice to this organization. It is my strong recommendation that the Maritime Administration be excluded from the transfer to the Transportation Department, as proposed under the bill we are now considering.

I shall support any amendment that would tend to accomplish this end. We cannot bury the merchant marine in the proposed new agency or permit it to remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. It should be established as a separate unit which can deal with the problems the merchant marine has to face, and which are very unlike to those of any other method of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, let us follow President Johnson's pledge when, in his state of the Union message of January 1965, he stated that his administration would find a "new policy for our merchant marine."

Let us interpret that pledge as one favoring an independent Maritime Administration so that our greatest source of sea transportation will get back to the strength where we will not have to rely upon foreign shipping to provide us with goods which are so vital to our economy and the national security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, I shall support this legislation but I believe that the new department should concern itself with domestic transportation problems, while an independent agency should be established to concern itself with international transportation affairs. Under this separation all segments of the transportation field would have, to a great extent, a voice in their own type of transportation.

AUTOMOBILE AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

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

Mr. FARNLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in Life magazine of September 2, 1966, regarding automobile and highway safety:

WHY KEEP SAFETY IN THE DARK?

The auto safety hearings that produced some of Washington's better dramas of the past season also produced two bills that should make it a little less easy for American drivers to kill themselves. The debates of the experts, for one thing, established the point that in most accidents there are two collisions, not one.

August 30, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20433

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 governments; 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 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 supervise 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.

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS ENTITLED TO 10-PERCENT BAD-DEBT RESERVES

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 I cosponsored legislation in the Florida Legislature which incorporated by that special act the business development corporation of the State of Florida, now known as the Industrial Development Corp. of Florida. I am today introducing in this Congress legislation for the benefit of that corporation, and others like it throughout the United States.

My bill will amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that these corporations may deduct additions to their bad debt reserves up to an aggregate reserve amount equal to 10 percent of loans made by them. This will remedy the present situation where there are no special provisions in the Internal Revenue Code regarding bad-debt reserves of business development corporations.

In practice they have been allowed to accumulate only nominal bad debt reserves of from between 1 to 4 percent, whereas the commercial banks have a 2.4 percent formula by Treasury ruling and yet the business development corporations make loans those banks do not. In view of this, and since the business development corporation's losses on their loans have been far greater than losses of commercial banks, it is believed that a bad-debt reserve of 10 percent should be

acceptable as a reasonable reserve by the Internal Revenue Service without question.

I am very glad that I can once again be working on behalf of these excellent corporations. Their work is commendable and I have seen the excellent results of this in my own congressional district and throughout the State of Florida. I am quite sure that this is the case throughout the Nation wherever these corporations are operating and in existence. The primary function of business development corporations is to assist in the development and maintenance of industries within the State and to do so by providing financing for smaller companies who are unable to obtain conventional financing through banking institutions and insurance companies by reason of their speculative and uncertain financial condition.

It is through this type of operation that the purpose of the corporations is not to make a substantial profit but rather to serve a public and community purpose.

This purpose alone gives us very good reason to give due consideration to favorable action on the legislation which I have introduced.

Secondly, we find reason in the fact that the investment of the investments of the business development corporations are inherently extremely risky. It is the policy that the business development corporations' loans are those which no conventional commercial lender will make and which are thereby not bankable loans. Almost all of these loans are secured, but the security amounts to whatever is available, although in many cases the collateral is marginal. Sometimes this is as simple as a personal guarantee. Even the criteria for the granting of loans by the corporations are decisively different from the commercial lenders, as can be seen in the following enumerations:

First. The potential borrower cannot get financing from conventional sources;

Second. The potential borrower provides or is hoped to provide substantial employment opportunities;

Third. The potential borrower's obligations are expected to increase the local tax base; or

Fourth. For other reason the potential borrower's concern is expected to make a contribution to the economic welfare of the State.

Therefore, we have a quasi-public organization with the primary criterion for making loans without a profit but rather whether the loan will aid the employment level and the economy generally within the State of the corporation.

By Treasury ruling the small business investment corporations are allowed—until 1968—10 percent bad-debt reserves without being questioned by the IRS and these investment corporations are basically profit seeking organizations. Yet, our business development corporations are making loans which are equally risky and probably more risky than loans made by the small business investment companies without the privilege of an equal bad-debt reserve.

This increase is also needed whereby the development corporations may attract more equity capital and will further permit them to increase their loan limits and their loan programs. An expansion of the activities of the business development corporations is highly desirable in that it will encourage small business within their States by providing small business with the financing it can begin with and continue operations.

I feel very strongly we have reasons of considerable merit to give our attention and am respectfully requesting that due consideration be given this legislation with the earliest possible and favorable action by this Congress.

HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL MUST BE SAVED

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

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the United States is a nation committed to physical fitness. Athletics—for amusement or participation—play a large role in our way of life. The towering structure of American sports is built upon a broad, granite-firm foundation. That foundation is amateur competition, on the college and, more basically, on the high school level. The high school athlete of today builds on the experience of his past and grows to be the professional athlete of tomorrow. The years of preparation are long, and only a few aspirants rise to the level of professional sport.

These young athletes must have the tools for development—they must have proper equipment and proper playing conditions. They must have the intangibles as well: The competitive urge; the will to win; the spirit—for these are coequal with the overall educational process.

That competitive athletics are an integral part of our educational process; that they provide a challenge which transcends mere physical ability—a challenge of the mind, of the attitude, of the spirit—cannot be denied. It is the same type of spirit which molded a nation less than two centuries ago; the same type of indomitable spirit evident in an inspired inventor named Alexander Graham Bell; the same type of spirit that was immortalized by a handicapped American named Helen Keller; the same type of spirit which propelled a mid-south country football player named Charley Connerly from pigskin obscurity into the heralded ranks of professional quarterback greats.

The basis of high school football—is spirit: The roar of enthusiasm from a hundred classmates; the unrestrained cheer of a thousand fans; or, in the words of Grantland Rice, just the "tumult and the shouting." The low, but audible, hum of approval from the grandstand provides inspiration. The skill, agility and prowess of the athlete then make him react. Inspiration and skill help to transform the young athlete into a man.

The loss of the spectator means the loss of the principal source of financial support for all high school athletics. The revenue derived from these football games pays for vast facilities for physical education and recreational athletics; it pays for football helmets, baseball bats, basketballs. The revenue that the spectator provides at a high school football game is needed. But the fan provides something far more important. He infuses spirit. The loss of the fan means the loss of sports vitality.

Today, the existence of high school football—a Friday night event in virtually every high school town in the country—is threatened by television. Professional football is scheduled to be shown on television Friday nights. Just as mass televising of major league baseball wrecked the minor leagues. So professional football is devouring its young.

Mr. Speaker, we have at our disposal means to head off this threat to the existence of high school athletics. S. 950, among other things, will prevent the televising of professional football games on Friday evenings, when most high school games are held.

This measure passed the Senate last year, but the House has been remiss. The Judiciary Committee has not yet held hearings on the bill. The 1966 high school football season has begun and professional football games are being televised on Friday night through September. This is not fair, Mr. Speaker, to the young athlete. These high school football players will be the stars of pro ball a few short years from now. These football players will remember that Friday night when thousands of anxious fans watched, waited, and cheered. These athletes will not forget those exuberant high school years.

I respectfully urge the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on S. 950 at an early date, and I urge my colleagues to give their support to this measure. The House must act to insure the perpetuation of high school football.

FARM LABOR

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, in a speech to the House, I found it necessary to take issue with Columnist John Chamberlain on the question of farm labor. In a subsequent column, while making no concessions, he found it possible to make what I considered to be a complimentary reference to me, which under the circumstances, was much appreciated.

Once again, however, I find it necessary to take issue with Mr. Chamberlain and his column which appeared in the Washington Post on August 20. I would hasten to add that I think he has been misled by the inaccurate and incomplete information which I am sure was fed to him.

It is simply amazing to me that a few selfish, uninformed, or misguided per-

sons, armed with distorted facts or empty rhetoric, would persist in crying about the farm-labor situation in California. It is amazing for the cold hard facts show that since the end of Public Law 78 on December 31, 1966, farm income has gone up, farm wages have gone up and employment of American farmworkers has gone up.

Yet, Mr. Chamberlain's column attempts to convince us that California growers are suffering without their braceros. It just is not so.

When Secretary of Labor Wirtz, on August 1, authorized the admission of 6,000 Mexicans to help harvest tomatoes, it was not an act of capitulation or a matter of yielding to pressures, as Mr. Chamberlain's article would have us believe. The 6,000 admitted this year is a further and marked reduction which represents the gradual and encouraging transition to domestic farm labor.

Mr. Chamberlain degrades those Americans who make their living working in the fields if he believes that:

California's ranchers found it impossible to "make do" with vacationing high school students, moochers, and alcoholics from the skid rows of big cities, and recruits from east of the Rockies who, after using transportation subsidies as a means of getting to the West Coast, quit after a few days work.

This is hardly a fair picture of those Americans who choose to toil in the fields for a living.

Americans are working in vast numbers in harvesting agricultural products. In the first half of 1965, domestic farm employment in California was up 14 percent over the same period in 1964, the last bracero year. In the first half of this year, it was up 4 percent over 1965.

An uneven distribution of farmworkers throughout the country may cause tight labor situations in some areas. But, with the unemployment rate for agricultural workers at 3.4 percent, farm workers are available. And growers, just as employers in other industries, must put forth some effort to obtain workers—either through their own recruitment or through help from the public employment service.

Mr. Chamberlain's column contends that California lemon growers suffered tribulations when they could not get needed bracero help. If he means by "tribulations" the normal difficulties employers have in getting workers, then this is probably true. However, lemon growers had no trouble finding workers as soon as they were willing to pay a decent living wage.

In spite of the cries of the few who would retain the bracero blemish on this country's agricultural scene, average farm income rose 23 percent in 1965—breaking all records.

Certainly California shared in this prosperity. Last year, realized net income per farm hit \$11,160, down slightly from 1964, but up 16.3 percent over the annual average for 1960-64.

It was truly a blue-ribbon year as my State's farm income hit an alltime high of \$3.7 billion. California growers showed profits of slightly over 27 percent.

These facts testify to the success of

the transition to domestic farm labor. The thousands of Americans now employed in seasonal farm work shows that when wages and working conditions are decent, Americans will work in the fields and groves.

Mr. Chamberlain's column smugly contends victory in Secretary Wirtz's admitting several thousand foreign workers to relieve one tight labor situation in my State. I fail to see how anyone can claim a "victory." The fact is that the number of foreign workers admitted this year is far less than in previous years, and is testimony to the fact that we are making a successful, long-awaited and long-needed transition to the use of our own people to fill our own jobs.

The whole country—California included—has benefited from the termination of mass importing of foreign farm labor. It has been a milestone in bringing the farm worker into the mainstream of our economic life.

ATTEMPTED DESTRUCTION OF THATCHER FERRY BRIDGE IN CANAL ZONE

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in 1962 the opening of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge across the Panama Canal at Balboa, C.Z., was celebrated with elaborate ceremonies attended by high officials of the United States, Panama, and other countries, and by an assembly of 20,000 or more people from the Canal Zone and Panama.

This bridge and its approaches are located entirely in the Canal Zone and were constructed at a cost of some \$20 million of the U.S. taxpayers money. Provided as a substitute for the Thatcher ferry, which for 30 years had functioned so well, it has been a tremendous service to all people of the Isthmus and was so recognized by thoughtful citizens of both Panama and the Canal Zone.

In what must have been an alarming surprise to those who have not studied Isthmian history, a number of saboteurs, apparently from Panama, on July 8, 1966, threw an explosive aimed at one of the bases of the bridge. Fortunately, it missed its target and exploded in the water without damaging the bridge.

Though the press of Panama reported the incident and from day to day commented thereon, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the press of the United States has treated it with silence. Thus the people of our country and the Congress do not know what is occurring in Panama in the way of serious terroristic activity at the time that country is seeking sovereignty over the Canal Zone and joint and equal participation in the management of the Panama Canal.

From the information so far published in Panamanian newspapers, it appears that the National Department of Investigation—DENI—of Panama and the Panamanian district attorney are investigating the incident, that five suspects have