

So Mr. HOLLAND's amendment was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

I yield myself the time to ask the majority leader as to his desires. I am prepared to lay down the child labor amendment and make it the pending business. I am not prepared to debate it tonight. I should like the majority leader to give us his wishes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question of the distinguished senior Senator from New York, there will be no more votes tonight, because I think we are all pretty tired.

However, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senate, there will be no morning hour, and at 10 o'clock, at the conclusion of the prayer and the reading of the Journal, we will go directly on the bill and the Javits amendment, which I understand will be the pending business at that time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 759 and ask unanimous consent that debate on it may be suspended until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment may be dispensed with but that it be printed at this point in the Record.

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

The amendment (No. 759) is as follows:

On page 43, strike out lines 14 through 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) (1) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply to any employee employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed, if such employee—

"(A) is employed by his parents, or by a person standing in the place of his parent, on a farm owned or operated by such parent or person, or on a neighboring farm, as defined by the Secretary of Labor, or

"(B) is fourteen years of age or over, or

"(C) is twelve years of age or over and is employed on a farm to which he commutes daily within twenty-five miles of his permanent residence, and (1) such employment is with the written consent of his parent or person standing in place of his parent, or (2) his parent or person standing in place of his parent is also employed on the same farm. The Secretary may by regulation pre-

scribe maximum working hours and other conditions for the protection of the health and safety of children employed pursuant to this subparagraph (C)."

INTEREST RATES AND INFLATION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, one of the most persistently consistent factors contributing to the inflation we are now experiencing is the rise in corporate profits. With variations in depreciation, and other bookkeeping gimmicks, the best measure of corporate well-being is profits plus capital consumption allowances.

In 1960, profits after taxes plus allowances amounted to \$51.6 billion. By 1965, this figure had risen to \$80.8, and is now running at about \$87.2 billion. This represents an increase, over the short span of 5 or 6 years of some 69 percent. It should be noted that a very significant portion of this increase in corporate profits is attributable to tax reduction, investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation.

With corporate health so clearly robust, many questions are being asked about the odd behavior of the stock market.

Many economists think a great many economic decisions are psychologically based. In any event, there is much uncertainty about the future course of the economy and of Government actions affecting the economy.

The indicators of economic health, it should be realized, are mixed. As I have just said, corporate profits and dividends continue to rise sharply. The stock market has recently suffered sharp declines. Total industrial activity continues brisk, but certain segments, notably housing starts and automobile sales, have fallen off badly.

I think it is generally realized that high interest rates cannot really regulate the economy. Reliance upon high and higher interest rates to curb inflation has brought imbalances and inequities.

Everyone is waiting for the President, with the power and prestige of the Office of President, backed up as he is by the wealth of talent in the Council of Economic Advisers, the Treasury Department, various agencies with credit and debt management functions to provide the leadership that is needed and necessary to bring down usurious interest rates. The acuteness of the need for such Presidential leadership is illustrated by the fact that Johnson interest rates are now higher than Hoover rates, higher now than at any time in 45 years.

Time is fast running out for any meaningful action to be taken before Congress adjourns this year. The President had an opportunity yesterday at his news conference to take and to announce his arrival at some hard decisions. He passed. He settled for platitudes, mild admonitions, and an indefinite reference to congressional action. He chose to ignore the Truman maxim, "The buck stops here." But there is yet time for action. Without action both interest rates and the cost of living will further rise, bringing hardship in their wake.

Mr. President, the time is short, but there is yet time to act.

ACHIEVING PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, former Ambassador Anthony B. Akers, an experienced individual in the field of diplomacy and a distinguished and thoughtful man, has developed a memorandum concerning the possibility of achieving a peaceful and generally acceptable solution to the Vietnam problem.

I believe that his memorandum might be of interest not only to our country but to other countries. In any case, I am sure it will interest my colleagues and for this reason I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

I believe this approach is a worthwhile one and that the Akers proposal should be followed to its logical conclusion. Both as an old friend of Mr. Akers and as an American, I wish him every success in his efforts.

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

MEMORANDUM: PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS IN RE VIETNAM, AUGUST 3, 1966

I. PREFATORY COMMENT:

North and South Vietnam combined comprise 127,000 square miles and more than 34 million people supported essentially by a rice-growing economy based on ancient and traditional social systems evolved by a people identifiable 2000 years ago.

In the same year, 1945, that the United Nations was founded, there began in Vietnam the fateful struggle which soon flared into open warfare. Even before that date Vietnam had become a war torn area, occupied by the Japanese in 1940. For more than a quarter century, therefore, the tides of violence in Vietnam have ebbed and flowed across the headlines of the world. Most of the major powers have been involved in either principal or ancillary roles at one time or another. So have several small nations.

Although the struggle in Vietnam has paralleled the life of the United Nations, that body has been neither willing nor seemingly able to influence the course of events there.

From 1945-54 the Vietnamese struggle centered on the issue of colonialism and the political question of self-determination. After the defeat of French military forces at Dienbienphu, the cease-fire and Geneva Accords of 1954 ended colonialism and divided Vietnam into North and South with provisions for subsequent elections. Such elections were not held in either South Vietnam or in North Vietnam.

Since 1954 the struggle, often brutal and cruel in character, has found its focus in South Vietnam between forces vying for control of South Vietnam. Each side has received and is receiving external assistance. More recently the conflict has been brought into North Vietnam, especially through air-bombing.

II. PRINCIPLE OF UNITED NATION'S INTERVENTION

Conciliation is the keynote to successful intervention by the United Nations in the Vietnamese struggle. The United Nations cannot intervene with success if it attempts to deal with charges and counter-charges of "aggression" or attempts to censure or to assess responsibility for the present situation in Viet Nam. It is imperative that the United Nations function strictly as a mediatory framework which looks only forward—toward peaceful solution. If it is to succeed in Viet Nam, the United Nations must adhere strictly to its most basic purpose: serving as an international framework of last resort to which appeal can be made above the intense fervor of political passion and continuing military combat.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 222 Leg.] YEAS—22

- | | | |
|---------|----------------|----------------|
| Case | Kennedy, Mass. | Pell |
| Clark | Kennedy, N.Y. | Proxmire |
| Douglas | Kuchel | Ribicoff |
| Fong | Magnuson | Tydings |
| Hart | McGee | Williams, N.J. |
| Inouye | Moss | Young, Ohio |
| Jackson | Neuberger | |
| Javits | Pastore | |

NAYS—64

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Alken | Ervin | Morton |
| Allott | Fannin | Mundt |
| Anderson | Fulbright | Muskie |
| Bass | Gore | Pearson |
| Bayh | Griffin | Prouty |
| Bible | Harris | Randolph |
| Boggs | Hickenlooper | Robertson |
| Brewster | Hill | Russell, S.C. |
| Burdick | Holland | Russell, Ga. |
| Byrd, Va. | Hruska | Saltonstall |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Jordan, N.C. | Scott |
| Cannon | Lausche | Smith |
| Carlson | Long, La. | Stennis |
| Church | McCarthy | Symington |
| Cooper | McClellan | Talmadge |
| Cotton | McGovern | Thurmond |
| Curtis | McIntyre | Tower |
| Dirksen | Miller | Williams, Del. |
| Dodd | Mondale | Yarborough |
| Dominick | Monroney | Young, N. Dak. |
| Eastland | Montoya | |
| Ellender | Morse | |

NOT VOTING—14

- | | | |
|----------|---------------|----------|
| Bartlett | Jordan, Idaho | Nelson |
| Bennett | Long, Mo. | Simpson |
| Gruening | Mansfield | Smathers |
| Hartke | Metcalf | Sparkman |
| Hayden | Murphy | |

So Mr. KUCHEL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES IN THE CASE OF MINING

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on H.R. 4665, a bill relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4665) relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair

Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all time has been yielded back in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Florida which would strike the provisions with respect to agricultural workers from the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that there were 22 votes to put agricultural labor on parity with industrial labor. There were two live pairs. That makes 24 votes for that position.

If there is any better showing required that there is already sentiment existing to put agricultural labor on comparable rates with industrial labor, we have had that demonstrated here in the last few minutes.

I hope that the amendment can be agreed to.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Chair restore the Senate to order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I point out that the amendment of the Senator from Florida would strike all agricultural labor from the protection afforded by the bill. The agricultural labor that would be covered under the bill involves only 1.6 percent of the farms in the country, 98.4 percent of the farms in the United States are exempt under the pending bill. That 1.6 percent of the farms in the country employ 390,000 farm laborers.

It is the position of the House and of the committee that we should support this very modest provision in the bill to give protection to some agricultural workers. Since the Kuchel amendment has been rejected, it would go only to \$1.30 and stop there.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I was about to yield back 20 seconds.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi. Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, can the Senator from Texas guarantee that if this measure becomes law there will not be a further encroachment on the little fellows which will crush them to death?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We are not seeking to crush them to death. This involves only 1.6 percent of the farms all over America. This is a bill to protect the small farmers and put them in a competitive position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the

Senator from Florida. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 51, as follows:

[No. 223 Leg.]

YEAS—37

- | | | |
|-----------|--------------|----------------|
| Allott | Fannin | Robertson |
| Bass | Fulbright | Russell, S.C. |
| Boggs | Hickenlooper | Russell, Ga. |
| Byrd, Va. | Hill | Scott |
| Carlson | Holland | Smathers |
| Cooper | Hruska | Stennis |
| Cotton | Jordan, N.C. | Talmadge |
| Curtis | Lausche | Thurmond |
| Dirksen | Long, La. | Tower |
| Dominick | McClellan | Williams, Del. |
| Eastland | Morton | Young, N. Dak. |
| Ellender | Mundt | |
| Ervin | Pearson | |

NAYS—51

- | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Alken | Hart | Moss |
| Anderson | Inouye | Muskie |
| Bayh | Jackson | Nelson |
| Bible | Javits | Neuberger |
| Brewster | Kennedy, Mass. | Pastore |
| Burdick | Kennedy, N.Y. | Pell |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Kuchel | Prouty |
| Cannon | Magnuson | Proxmire |
| Case | McCarthy | Randolph |
| Church | McGee | Ribicoff |
| Clark | McGovern | Saltonstall |
| Dodd | McIntyre | Smith |
| Douglas | Miller | Symington |
| Fong | Mondale | Tydings |
| Gore | Monroney | Williams, N.J. |
| Griffin | Montoya | Yarborough |
| Harris | Morse | Young, Ohio |

NOT VOTING—12

- | | | |
|----------|---------------|----------|
| Bartlett | Hayden | Metcalf |
| Bennett | Jordan, Idaho | Murphy |
| Gruening | Long, Mo. | Simpson |
| Hartke | Mansfield | Sparkman |

August 25, 1966

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R00040010005-2

19777

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

The United Nations must encourage negotiations, and, if that does not succeed, it must then invoke the ballot box of the electoral process in the cause of self-determination.

Although the keynote is conciliation, there exists much persuasive power in the "cleansing, clarifying and compelling" influence of the bright glare of the "world spotlight" shining with continuous intensity on the Vietnamese situation.

With a reasonable proposal for settlement subject to reasonable modifications spelled out in detail beforehand, obstructionism would soon become apparent to the entire world in such a cleansing intensity of light from the very first step through final settlement.

III. THE QUESTION AT ISSUE AND THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Irrefutably the central question at issue in Vietnam, admitted by both sides, is the political question involving the inherent right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own fate. Irrefutable, also, is the clarity of intent and meaning of the "Purposes and Principles" of the United Nations Charter set forth in Article 1 as follows:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;"

IV. THE THREAT TO PEACE AND THE UNITED NATIONS OBLIGATION

It is self-evident that the Vietnamese situation now constitutes, and for an extended period of time has constituted, a clear and continuing threat to international peace. It follows, therefore that the United Nations has an obligation and enduring responsibility under its Charter to remove such an obvious threat to world peace and actively to participate in the settlement of the Vietnamese struggle.

Neither North nor South Vietnam is a member of the United Nations. In this matter Section 6 of Article 2 of the United Nations Charter provides jurisdiction:

"6. The Organization shall ensure that states which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these Principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security."

It is not enough for the United Nations to attempt to use its "good offices" to stop the fighting and to encourage negotiations. The Secretary General and member nations already have offered these placatory measures.

It now becomes the solemn obligation of the United Nations actively to intervene.

V. TWO PROPOSED COURSES OF ACTION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

The two courses set forth below call for immediate initiation of action by the United Nations. Course A is aimed toward the logical first step of negotiation, and course B is based on self-determination through the electoral process. The failure of Course A leaves no productive alternative except to invoke immediate pursuit of Course B.

Course A: 1. The Secretary-General and/or the Security Council shall summon a conference of representatives of the governments of all member nations of the United Nations which would be entitled, as Asiatic-Pacific countries, to membership in a "re-

gional arrangement" or "regional agency" convoked for the purpose of considering the Vietnamese problem under Chapter VIII ("Regional Arrangements") of the Charter of the United Nations. To such conference the Secretary-General and/or the Security Council also shall summon: (a) the principals in the Vietnamese conflict; and, (b) all other Asiatic-Pacific nations not now members of the United Nations which would be entitled to membership in such a "regional arrangement" if such nations were now members of the United Nations.

2. Upon the convocation of such conference the Secretary-General and/or the Security Council shall declare that the Vietnamese situation constitutes a grave threat to international peace and world order and shall call for a cease-fire in Vietnam to be followed immediately by negotiations "without prior conditions" between the principals.

3. Such conference would proceed to establish an "ad hoc Regional Agency" made up of members and non-members of the United Nations. Such agency then would proceed to oversee negotiations between the principals of the Vietnamese conflict.

If course A does not succeed in a timely manner, then, either through such "ad hoc Regional Agency" or otherwise, Course B shall be invoked with dispatch.

Course B: "Quarantine Cordon of Peace"— Under the peace-keeping mandate of the Charter, the United Nations not only has the right but the obligation and moral duty to prevent and remove threats to the peace. Furthermore, when the principal question at issue relates to the right of a people to determine their own fate and such issue is conjoined with military action which gravely has threatened international peace for an extended period of time, and repeated attempts to inflame negotiations between the principals have failed, then it becomes clearly obligatory upon the United Nations to ring such a region with a "Quarantine Cordon of Peace", and to proceed with all deliberate speed to provide an appropriately supervised electoral framework in order that self-determination may take place.

2. It is proposed, therefore, that the United Nations proceed at once through the Security Council and/or the General Assembly as follows:

(a) Declare that the conflict in Vietnam now constitutes a grave and constantly recurring threat to international peace.

(b) Declare that a United Nations team is being dispatched to both North and South Vietnam for the purpose of informing the governments of the belligerents that the United Nations has decreed that the Vietnamese conflict now constitutes a grave and constantly recurring threat to international peace and world order; and that the United Nations calls upon the government of North Vietnam and its allies and the government of South Vietnam and its allies to enter at once upon a cease-fire under the following conditions:

(1) Simultaneously with the cease-fire the United Nations shall mandate a "Quarantine Cordon of Peace" conterminal with the borders of South Vietnam and extending three miles on each side of such borders.

(2) Within a 40-day period dating from the cease-fire all foreign and non-resident military personnel shall be removed outside the borders of South Vietnam except military personnel designated by the United Nations for peace-keeping purposes.

(3) The United Nations immediately shall begin establishment of a framework for the supervision of elections in South Vietnam to be held 180 days from the date of cease-fire. Such elections shall be held by secret ballot for all offices of a national constituent legislative body, and for at least a chief executive officer and deputy chief executive. During the interim 180 day period South Vietnam shall be declared a "Peace Zone" under a special international "Interim Com-

mittee" of the United Nations. The integrity of such "Peace Zone" shall be guaranteed by armed units designated by the United Nations. Such "Interim Committee" administrative framework shall regularly consult with a "Consultative Assemblage" composed of fifteen citizens of South Vietnam. This "Consultative Assemblage" membership shall be representative as far as possible, of all the sections of the South Vietnamese people, and the members shall be designated by the Secretary-General immediately upon effectuation of a cease-fire.

(4) One year after the duly elected government of South Vietnam shall have assumed office, South Vietnam and North Vietnam shall be invited to become members of the United Nations.

(5) The question as to whether South Vietnam and North Vietnam shall be reunited shall be postponed for a period of twelve years from cease-fire at the end of which time elections shall be held separately in each country to determine the will of the electorate in each country in this matter. Such elections at the end of twelve years shall be ordered by the government of each country and shall be overseen by United Nations teams of observers. In the alternative the two then duly constituted governments of South Vietnam and North Vietnam may negotiate the question of reunification at the end of such twelve year period.

(6) Concurrently with the cease-fire there shall be established a United Nations Neutrality Zone for Southeast Asia under the auspices of the United Nations. The following nations shall be invited to join: Thailand, Laos, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Cambodia.

Those nations which join shall be declared neutral nations by the United Nations and their neutrality and territorial integrity guaranteed by the United Nations provided all foreign troops are removed from their territories within a 40 day period after joining the Neutrality Zone. Such neutral countries shall be permitted to continue limited alliances with other nations but shall not receive military assistance through such alliances.

VI. CONCLUDING COMMENT

It is urgent that the Vietnam question find its way on to the United Nations agenda immediately. It is enormously important that the United Nations have a definitive plan of action in mind when it considers the Vietnam question. There are, of course, several possible approaches to the problem. "Course A" and "Course B" mirror the broad meaning of the United Nations Charter.

These proposed courses of action have been drawn in full awareness of the difficulties inherent in implementation. The difference in the character of measures taken by the Security Council as compared to the General Assembly have been borne in mind, e.g. that the General Assembly cannot order but can only recommend, while the Security Council may order and enforce its order. Cognizance has been taken also of the fact that, as yet, the political will to have the United Nations assume such a role in the Vietnamese struggle has been either not present, or at least not marshalled effectively. Neither North Vietnam nor South Vietnam is a member of the United Nations. Furthermore, the most populous nation in the world, which is deeply involved in the Vietnamese conflict is not a member. In addition, a great power may elect to invoke the veto in the Security Council against even the inscription on the Council's agenda of any item relating to Vietnam. Those who would oppose such course of action may peremptorily state that the United Nations has no business in Vietnam because the situation is properly the concern of the Geneva Conference which has no connection with the United Nations. There are those who may restate the view that the United Nations has

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R00040010005-2

no right to examine the problem, or that United Nations action would be inappropriate, or that the "Purposes and Principles" of the United Nations Charter set forth merely general principles rather than more substantive obligations.

Technicians can while away weeks, months and years on the meaning of the same words in different contexts or on the differing legal interpretations of similar actions as employed by varying agencies of the United Nations.

In the meantime men, women and children are being killed in a war which hopefully could be terminated through a collective will to act on the part of member nations of the United Nations.

It would be difficult to find phrases more descriptive of the United Nations purposes than "to maintain international peace" and "self-determination of peoples." The entire universe is now aware that Vietnam constitutes a continuing threat to world order—the kind of threat which may lead to universal conflagration. The principals in the Vietnamese struggle readily concede that the basic question at issue is that of the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own fate.

In such situation there should exist an avenue of appeal to some supreme international authority, as far removed as possible from political passions, which can function in a mediatory or conciliatory capacity. The United Nations must serve such purpose until a better framework is created.

What has become of the promise of San Francisco in 1945 which began:

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind . . . ?"

On June 30, 1936 Halle Selassie made a memorable address before the Assembly of the League of Nations pleading for the League's intervention, which was not forthcoming. The League subsequently failed and World War II followed shortly thereafter. The last words of Halle Selassie's fervent pleas ever since have haunted mankind:

"Representatives of the world . . . What answer am I to take back to my people?"

Wars, and their scope and force have progressed trigonometrically since that time. In the event of nuclear holocaust no man on earth can be safe.

Today the question could be better phrased:

"Representatives of the world . . . what answer shall all of us take back to all our peoples?"

TOP STATE DEPARTMENT POSTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times contains an article written by Richard Eder, entitled "Johnson Weighs Appointments to Top State Department Posts."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, of course, this article is pure speculation, but I must say that some of the names mentioned for high positions in the State Department send chills down the backs of a number of members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whose attention I have brought the article.

Those of us interested in peace and international cooperation are gravely concerned at some of the nominations pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations of individuals of complete in-

tegrity and highly skilled but who would, apparently, rather fight than switch.

I have no doubt that if further names come before the Senate for its advice and consent with respect to confirmation, the hearings in the Committee on Foreign Relations will be sufficiently extensive to develop to what extent these gentlemen are hard liners or are, on the contrary, interested in minimizing the conflict between East and West and in moving forward through the orderly development of international institutions toward the cause of peace.

Mr. President, I am confident, at least with respect to one of the nominations now pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations, that there will be extensive debate on the floor of the Senate with respect to whether the individual—who is gentleman of great ability and high integrity—nevertheless, represents so obsolete an attitude toward foreign policy that his confirmation might be inadvisable.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Aug. 25, 1966]

JOHNSON WEIGHS APPOINTMENTS TO TOP STATE DEPARTMENT POSTS

(By Richard Eder)

WASHINGTON, August 24.—President Johnson said today that he was nearing a decision on restaffing the rapidly emptying top echelon of the State Department, but gave no hint as to his choices.

The President announced at his news conference that he had "tentatively selected" a successor to Thomas C. Mann, who resigned in April as Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, the department's third-ranking post. [Question 16, Page 18.]

Mr. Johnson said that he would probably not disclose his choice until after U. Alexis Johnson, who ranks fourth in the department as Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs, was confirmed by the Senate as Ambassador to Japan.

Saying that "there will be several announcements there" the President appeared to indicate that he would announce the Deputy Under Secretary's successor at the same time.

The President said that there would be one or two other vacancies to be filled "below the Secretary of State." He thus foreshadowed the impending resignation of Under Secretary George W. Ball, and gave substance to reports that William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, was planning to leave the department.

The President also announced the nomination of John S. Hayes, a broadcasting executive, as Ambassador to Switzerland. One or two other ambassadorial appointments will be announced, he said, as soon as the countries to which the prospective ambassadors are destined have accepted them.

Mr. Johnson's disclosure that he had a candidate to fill one of the State Department's under secretaryships sharpened speculation here as to what the department's complexion would be once he had completed its most extensive reshuffling in many years.

Mr. Johnson's reference to changes below the secretary level made it clear that he intended to keep Dean Rusk where he is. The changes involve the three top policy posts under Mr. Rusk, and, if Mr. Crockett leaves, the top administrative post as well.

It is considered virtually certain that Alexis Johnson, who coordinates state operations in Vietnam and other critical areas with those of agencies such as the Defense Department and the Central Intelligence Agency, will be succeeded by a career Foreign Service officer. It is believed likely that a career officer will also fill the second under secretaryship—that formerly held by Mr. Mann.

Although speculation has ranged widely, the men most commonly mentioned for the two jobs—with no clear estimate of which man would get which job—are Lucius D. Battle, now Ambassador to the United Arab Republic, and Douglas MacArthur 2d, who is Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Two other names mentioned frequently, but somewhat less insistently, are those of William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, and Ridgway B. Knight, Ambassador to Belgium.

The most important choice, however, and one about which there is little informed speculation, is that of a successor to Under Secretary Ball.

There has been something of a tradition of choosing an Under Secretary whose views and style complement, if they do not contradict, those of the secretary.

Mr. Ball, for example, has argued for a more flexible policy on Vietnam than that advocated by Mr. Rusk and he was an advocate of close European cooperation, a subject that Mr. Rusk tends to leave alone.

Clark Clifford, a foreign policy adviser to Presidents Truman, Kennedy and Johnson, was reportedly a strong choice for the post. His health is not good, however, and his appointment is now being discounted.

Observers here suggest that the President is looking for a candidate who will bring, if not actually a fresh approach, at least something of a fresh image to the department. They suggest further that he should have somewhat more appeal to liberals in the Senate and elsewhere than the battle-worn figure of Mr. Rusk does.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I was unfortunately detained off the floor yesterday at the time the Senate adopted and thus cleared for the President the conference report on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. If I could have been present, I would have liked to have made the following comment.

While overall the legislation as sent to the President has much to commend it, I am disappointed that cut from the bill was the amendment which I sponsored to provide an additional \$2.5 million for school lunches in needy areas.

Mr. President, what disturbs me about this situation is that while we have been responsible in providing funds for the school lunch program as a whole—and this means lunches in suburbia and in the well-to-do neighborhoods as well as in the low-income areas—we are short-changing the schools in the poor areas where a high percentage of the children need the free or low-cost lunch. The able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] inserted in the RECORD a most compelling example of the need and value of this effort when the amendment was being considered—RECORD page 15118. He reported on the Annunciation Grade School of Denver, Colo.

Our sense of values is open to question if we are not able to see the need for additional expenditure in low-income neighborhoods. The hearings being conducted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RBICOFF] have made a real contribution in given us an idea of the scope of the problems we face in our urban centers. We are going to have to re-

hope to live where all the people can live together in a smaller world, at a higher level of prosperity, without wars. And we also hope, for our security and the peace of the world, that we will live where those of us who are Americans can be proud of that fact; where the statement, "Civis Americanus sum," will command respect everywhere. For we are the citizens of no mean state.

Yet the news reader today is so continually dismayed, so often sickened and discouraged by the truth as it arrives, that millions—with some justice—say: "I can't take any more. I hate to pick up a newspaper and read what's happening today."

Well, unfortunately, there's so much to know in this world that none of us can know very much. Each of us reads just enough to realize how immense are the problems. We think just enough to realize what is required to meet the tasks that face the United States.

May I ask you to read only a few words more? An editorial:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not in the lifetime of most men . . . has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so incalculable as at this time.

"The political caldron seethes and bubbles with uncertainty. Russia hangs, as usual, like a cloud, dark and silent, on the horizons; while all the energies, resources and influences of the British Empire are sorely tried, and are yet to be tried more sorely, in coping with the world's disturbed relations with China. It is a solemn moment and no man can foresee the end of our troubles."

A solemn moment. Yes, the writer was right. But it was not the end of the world.

This editorial appeared in Harper's Weekly in October, 1857.

In the century since 1857 America has made more progress than in all the years that go back to the Declaration of Independence; made more progress, in fact, than has been made by the human race as a whole in all the preceding centuries from the first day of human history.

Oh, yes, there have been many, many other times when things were stacked against us and we have somehow pulled through. We will again. This country was made for faith, not fear.

Vietnam Prepares for September Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, with the opening of South Vietnam's formal political campaign on tomorrow, the world is anxiously awaiting this southeast Asian nation's free elections to be held on September 11, 1966.

The framework to elect a constitutional assembly has been established and it is encouraging to note that Premier Nguyen Cao Ky has been actively promoting the coming elections. Displaying a departure from his usual military stance, Premier Ky has launched an educational program for the new electorate. He has held meetings with both civilian and military leaders, and pledged an election which would be fair and open. He has assured the Vietnamese populace that the elections would be supervised by candidates, civil servants, students, and military cadets.

Premier Ky's efforts in connection with the September elections were reviewed in a Saigon dispatch from Associated Press Writer George McArthur. Entitled "Election Season in Vietnam," the informative dispatch appeared in the August 10, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. Having met Mr. McArthur in the Philippines last November I am pleased to submit his article for inclusion in the RECORD:

ELECTION SEASON IN VIETNAM

(By George McArthur)

SAIGON.—Apparently reluctant no longer, Premier Nguyen Cao Ky is warming up to South Viet Nam's elections for a constitutional assembly, now only a month away.

With an air of increasing confidence, the 35-year-old military boss is playing a hard game of domestic politics. Even his critics agree that the dapper air vice marshal is promoting the September 11 elections now, although he only grudgingly accepted the idea last April, at the height of a Buddhist crisis.

Ky recently placed his senior colleagues before the press for a comprehensive, rose-tinted state of the nation report—military, political and economic.

He followed up with speeches and public appearances. He has seen a stream of callers, foreign and Vietnamese. He has ordered the military governors of the nation's 43 provinces to call in local notables and explain what the elections are about. By all accounts, those meetings were well attended, frequently in such neutral settings as schoolhouses.

Ky also summoned all province chiefs to Saigon for a three-day election conference, attended by other military—and civilian—leaders. Ky opened the meetings by pledging honest voting supervised by candidates, civil servants, students and military cadets.

Ky also has permitted his former chief rival, General Nguyen Chan Thi, to fly to the United States for an indefinite visit, despite an embarrassing six-months prison sentence Thi incurred for guessing wrong.

All this has given rise to some optimism about the elections. The optimism is most noticeable at the U.S. Embassy, which likes to dispatch good news to President Johnson.

On the other side of the ledger is the skeptical view of some officials, both Vietnamese and American, that the Premier is engaged primarily in an astute maneuver to sugarcoat his military rule and retain power.

Ky's statement that he would not be a presidential candidate in any future election has not dispelled the idea he will be. While Ky remains air force commander, as he says he will, the aloof little man with the well-trimmed mustache will be a power in Saigon.

Some facts of Vietnamese life cloud the prospects for civilian rule. It is difficult to envision an anti-Communist government in South Viet Nam which would not be under profound military influence.

Apart from the Viet Cong, military forces comprise the only nationwide political force of any effectiveness, with the possible exception of the minority Catholics. Buddhists, Confucianists and other sects making up the majority are fragmented and have yet to produce either positive programs or appealing leadership. The labor movement is politically feeble. So-called independent politicians have not ignited any significant section of public opinion, even in cities where some have relatively large followings.

The elections are not designed to oust soldiers from government life, but rather to produce an anti-Communist assembly with the specific—and only—task of writing a constitution.

The military-civilian directory, technically bossed by the chief of state, Lieutenant General Nguyen Van Thieu, can amend the draft constitution which the assembly will draw

up, but amendments can be overridden by a two-thirds vote of the assembly. Within 30 days after it is completed, Thieu must officially promulgate the constitution.

The assembly will have 117 seats. Nine will be filled by mountain tribesmen, four by border people of Cambodian extraction, and 104 will be elected by the rest of the population.

Despite the complications, more than 700 candidates applied. The military screening committee, appointed by the regime, accepted 629, after eliminating those deemed to be tainted by communism or neutralism.

About 50 of the candidates are military men, not all of them supported by Ky and the military junta. The rest can amend the draft constitution which represent a cross section of literate Vietnamese. Their political inclinations are unlikely to become clear until the formal campaign is permitted to start August 26.

The government limits printing costs for leaflets or posters—and does the printing itself.

The Greeks Aren't Gullible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it would be well for our State Department to follow the example of some of our allies in the conduct of foreign affairs and their perspective on communism. In an effort to provoke the State Department's thought processes, I insert in the RECORD, two articles by the distinguished international columnist, Dumitru Danielopol. They appeared in the Thursday, August 4, and the Friday, July 22, editions of the Aurora Beacon-News of Illinois:

[From the Aurora Beacon-News, July 22, 1966]

DUMITRU DANIELOPOL COMMENTS—THE GREEKS AREN'T GULLIBLE

ATHENS.—Don't talk to the Greeks about economic progress behind the Iron Curtain. They will laugh in your face.

"What progress?" they ask.

"Before the war the Greek peasants' standard of living was the lowest in Eastern Europe, now it is the highest," one Greek official told me.

In the Peloponnesus it is estimated that 80 per cent of the farmers drive their own cars. In neighbouring Albania, Bulgaria, Romania and Yugoslavia the figure doesn't approach 5 per cent.

Greeks are considered among the most astute businessmen in the world. Typically, they trade with Iron Curtain countries. They are in a position to know the Communist facts of life.

Communist propaganda may beguile President Johnson's missions of American businessmen, gullible Western journalists, but not the Greeks.

"Marxism has been good for us," taunted one Greek merchant in a recent conversation with an Eastern European Communist. "Before the war we used to buy wheat from you, now you come to buy wheat from us."

This just about sums up the situation in that part of Europe.

The Marxists destroyed their farmers, whom they considered class enemies, and they lost the means to feed their people. All the disasters that ensued are the consequence of the application of Marxist theories.

August 25, 1966

"You can compare Marx with a doctor who prescribes a cure for a disease he doesn't understand," one Greek official told me. "He wrote his book in the early days of the industrial revolution. He did not know what was wrong and why. He prescribed a blindfold cure. It was all nonsense."

The economics of the much ballyhooed tourist boom in Bulgaria and Romania was explained to me by an expert in Greek tourism which has become a fine art in this country.

The Greeks figure that in order to make money a hotel must be busy eight months a year.

On the Communist Black Sea coast the weather dictates a season of three to three and a half months. This means that they are operating at a loss. There is no remedy. But the Reds continue to build hotels and the more they build the more they lose.

In their anguish to get hard currencies, both Romania and Bulgaria are offering bargain prices for tourists from Western Europe.

For \$200 or \$250 one can get from Paris to Mamaia or Varna and back and spend three weeks at a Black Sea resort. This implies a very heavy loss, to their economies.

"It wouldn't be so bad," said one woman who spent a few days at a Bulgarian resort, "but the life there is so boring. There is nothing to do after one comes back from the beach—nowhere to go, nothing to see, nothing to buy that one wants or can use, no natives to talk to because they are kept away from foreigners.

"That is no vacation."

In economic terms this means that the losses incurred to the Communist economies by Government "give away" tourist programs, cannot be compensated in other ways.

From the Greek frontier to Sophia, the capital of Bulgaria there are 100 miles of bad road.

"You can't even get a cup of coffee on that road and there are only two gas stations," said the woman.

Doesn't this cut-rate Communist tourism compete with Greece's own business?

"Not really," said the Athens officials. "We cater to a different type of tourist, people who enjoy comfort, good food, good roads, good hotels, good sport."

The Greeks provide accommodations for the less well-heeled tourists. There are hotels and camps on the mainland and around the islands. Many artists, students, etc. come here to work, study or relax.

"Don't forget, people don't come to Greece only for the bathing. There are many things to see of great historical and archeological value.

"This is a year-round tourist land."

Can the Communists continue to operate indefinitely at a loss in the face of this Greek competition?

"Of course not," laughed the Athens official. "You cannot spend yourself rich."

[From the Aurora Beacon-News, Aug. 4, 1966]
DUMITRU DANIELOPOL COMMENTS—GREEKS
TRADE ON BARTER BASIS

ATHENS, GREECE.—"East-West trade a la Grec" operates differently from that of other Western countries, especially Britain.

The Greeks exchange goods with their Red neighbors under clearing agreements, strictly on a barter basis. They grant no credits. And they are not likely to be caught with large credit balances if the Communists default in their payments.

With their economies teetering dangerously, East European satellites are anxious to get long term credits from the West.

"All Communist governments know that their economies have failed," said a British expert on Eastern Europe recently. "They are trying hard to bring remedies. Will they be successful? No one knows."

Yet Britain continues to export to Eastern Europe on long credit terms.

"We don't do that," said Xenofon Zolotas, governor of the Bank of Greece. "We work strictly on a barter basis. If we don't find anything to buy, we stop selling."

"We buy meat and other animal products from Romania and Bulgaria," said another government official. "We need high protein foods. They want to sell us tractors. Every one of the Communist countries produces tractors which they cannot sell."

In their haste for Stalinist-type industrialization, the Communist satellites are over-industrialized—at least in terms of their internal market. They have pauperized the majority of the population, especially the peasants.

"Their economies are out of balance," explained the London expert.

The Greeks refuse the Communist tractors because they prefer Western manufactures.

"They are of a better quality and design," one official said. "The Communists offer theirs at bargain prices, but we still don't want them."

"Below cost price?"

"Of course; they would sell them at a loss. They need Western currency desperately."

The Romanians wanted to buy wheat from Greece some time ago, but the Greeks refused to sell.

"We want dollars for our wheat, but the Romanians had none," he explained.

When brain-washed Communists go to Greece and see the prosperity and activity in this non-Communist land they gasp with surprise.

Red diplomats have complained that the Greek workers who came to help in the embassies—plumbers, carpenters, painters—were "exploiting" them. Their prices were too high, the diplomats said.

The Greek government ordered an inquiry. They found that the workers were charging strictly Greek prices.

The Communists gasped. They couldn't believe Greek workers were so well paid.

Greek wages are between two and three times higher than those paid in Communist countries.

"The standard of living in the 'workers paradise' is appalling," said a Greek merchant.

While meat and other protein foods are rationed in the satellite countries, their Red governments export them to Greece, Spain and other countries.

"Is there a remedy?" I asked.

"Not under Marxist ideology," was the answer.

A Glorious Age Without Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that we are finding no limit to our ingenuity when it comes to buying now and paying later.

This administration has set a fine example in how this can be done, and as the following editorial from the Bristol, Tenn., Herald Courier indicates, new credit schemes appear endless.

This is really not a laughing matter. It is time we got down to serious deliberations and reversed this trend before it runs over us.

A GLORIOUS AGE WITHOUT MONEY

One of the glaring deficiencies in the Great Society is that there are still a few things—not many, of course, but a few—that you have to pay cash for.

It is a pleasure to report that this economic oversight is now being corrected.

In the near future it will be possible to walk up to your friendly vending machine and buy such necessities as candy, sandwiches, coffee, desserts and other delicacies without spending a cent of real money.

You will merely present a permanent credit card which the vending machine registers by means of an electronic device.

The company which plans to introduce this further step toward total on-the-cuff living concedes that use of the wonder machines may be limited at first to institutions and industrial plants, for the very practical reason that it will cost a lot of—forgive the expression—cash to install them.

An elaborate electronic memory unit and a computer will be needed to enable the vending machine to sell stuff on tick.

This paraphernalia will cost about \$2,000 in addition to the price of the vending machines, which itself isn't peanuts.

With this break-through in the currency curtain, it will undoubtedly be only a matter of time until such other irritating cash items as public phone calls, toll fares, parking meters and similar hangovers from medieval living will be eliminated and we can enjoy a glorious age in which we can charge everything now and pay later.

The ultimate Utopia will come, of course, when some supergenius figures out a way to charge now and never pay later.

Then society will really be great!

And We Wish Shriver a Happy Future, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following exchange of correspondence between Mr. Sargent Shriver and Mr. Leonard Inskip. I surely appreciated the humor of Mr. Inskip.

Mr. Shriver gave evidence of the ridiculous confusion that still exists in the Office of Economic Opportunity. In just a small way it demonstrates that anytime you center all authority in Washington you create opportunities for gross mistakes as well as the ones which are small and humorous.

The letters follow:

AND WE WISH SHRIVER A HAPPY FUTURE, TOO

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The letter immediately below was received this week under the letterhead of the Office of Economic Opportunity (i.e., the headquarters command of the poverty war). The writer of the second letter—the addressee of the first—who became associate editor of the Tribune editorial/opinion page Aug. 1, is a graduate of Middlebury College in Vermont.)

AUGUST 1, 1966.

Mr. LEONARD INSKIP,
Editorial Pages, Minneapolis Tribune,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR Mr. INSKIP: I am happy to learn that you are one of some 20,000 students in America who have been selected to participate in the exciting pre-college program known as Upward Bound.

You will meet new responsibilities and challenges as an Upward Bound student. We hope you will also find new pleasures and excitement in the pursuit of learning.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, AUGUST 25, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress: my God, in Him will I trust.—Psalm 91: 2.

Eternal God, our Father, who art the Creator of the world and the everlasting sustainer of our spirits, without whom no one is wise, no one is good—we pause in Thy presence to invoke Thy blessing upon us and to offer unto Thee the devotion of our hearts.

Bless us as we meet this day and may we be given wisdom to make sound decisions, strength to walk in the way of justice and freedom for all, and good will to motivate all we say and do.

Bless Thou our country and make us now and always a people mindful of Thy favor, eager to do Thy will, willing to obey Thy commandments, and ready to live in Thy spirit of love.

Bless our Armed Forces at home and abroad. Strengthen their families and all their loved ones—separated from one another as they are; and, as some journey through the valley of the shadow of death, let them feel Thy strengthening presence and Thy comforting spirit.

May we as the leaders of this free land match this devotion by a deep dedication of our own spirits to the welfare of our beloved country, in the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3700) entitled "An act to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3688) entitled "An act to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction."

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

No. 142—17

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM FOR FISCAL 1966

Mr. HAYS submitted the following conference report and statement on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 888)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "ten"; and the House agree to the same.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
PAUL JONES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
B. EVERETT JORDAN,
CARL HAYDEN,
CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The concurrent resolution as passed by the Senate provided that there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 14,000 additional copies of its hearings (89th Cong., 2d Sess.) on supplemental foreign assistance, fiscal year 1966—Vietnam. The House amendment reduced the number of additional copies to be printed to 4,000. Under the conference agreement the number of additional copies to be printed is 10,000.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
PAUL JONES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

THE LATE HONORABLE WADE HAMPTON KITCHENS

(Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing on Monday last of one of our esteemed former colleagues.

Wade Hampton Kitchens, attorney, statesman, and veteran of three wars, passed away August 22 at the age of 87.

Wade Hampton Kitchens was a Member of the House during the 75th and 76th Congresses, from 1936 to 1940, and was a member of the Arkansas General Assembly for two terms.

Mr. Kitchens was a veteran of three wars—the Spanish American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and World War I. He was a member of the bar of the States of Arkansas, Tennessee, and Oklahoma, as well as a member of the Philippine bar. With the exception of the period of his military service, he practiced law in Magnolia, Ark., from 1909 until 2 years ago when illness forced him to retire.

Mr. Kitchens was born in Nevada County, the oldest of 12 children of James Monroe and Margarette Sherrill Kitchens. He attended the University of Arkansas, Southwestern Academy in Magnolia, and received his law degree from Cumberland University. He had taught school in Columbia County.

Following the Philippine Insurrection, Mr. Kitchens practiced law in Lingayen, Pangasinan Province, Philippine Islands, for 7 years. Then, he his wife, nee Lillie Dempsey of Waldo, and his son, Wade Hampton Kitchens, Jr., returned to the United States in 1909.

He volunteered in the 2d Arkansas National Guard as an enlisted man during World War I. He helped to organize a company of 162 men and was elected their captain. He was commissioned by Governor Brough as captain of K Company, 3d Arkansas National Guard, and by President Woodrow Wilson in August 1917 as captain of K Company, 154th Infantry, and served throughout World War I for 2 years, 1 year in this country and 1 year in Europe. In 1917 he was selected from among over 1,500 officers and sent to Washington to a conference attended by the Honorable Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War; the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and others. This conference was concerning the insurance of soldiers' allotments and allowances to their dependents while at war.

Wade Kitchens was a member of the Central Baptist Church. He is survived by one daughter, Mrs. Gladys Pickens of Magnolia, five grandchildren, and six brothers and sisters.

Military services were held for him at 4 p.m. Tuesday, at Lewis Funeral Home, Magnolia, by American Legion Post No. 3, of which he was a member. Interment was in Columbia Cemetery near his birthplace.

19789

19790

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 25, 1966

I am sure that all Members who had the privilege of knowing Wade Kitchens join me in extending condolences and deepest sympathy to his surviving family.

TRIBUTE TO WADE KITCHENS, SR.

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

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned of the passing of Wade Kitchens, Sr. I served with him in the 76th Congress, which was my first term here. Wade Kitchens offered me kindly advice and assisted me greatly in my work as a new Member of the House. I needed his counsel and he was ever ready to offer it.

He was a lawyer and a soldier of renown. He was admitted to the bar after his graduation from Cumberland Law School, Lebanon, Tenn., in the State of Tennessee, and later in the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, and finally in the Philippine Islands where he practiced for 7 years. He served for 2 years in the Spanish-American War and saw service in the Philippine insurrection. He enlisted in the U.S. Army when trouble broke out in Europe, and was commissioned a captain of infantry by President Woodrow Wilson. His service during World War I consisted of 1 year in the United States and 1 year in the European theater.

Wade Kitchens served the Seventh District of the State of Arkansas in the House of Representatives with honor and distinction. The district at that time consisted of the counties of Ashley, Bradley, Calhoun, Chicot, Clark, Columbia, Hempstead, Lafayette, Nevada, Ouachita, and Union.

He worked for flood control improvements on the Ouachita River and for the betterment of agriculture. He interested himself in legislation with respect to the natural resources of his native State, including most especially problems having to do with the production and refining of oil and natural gas. He was a dedicated and devoted public servant. He possessed a pleasing personality and a sense of humor which endeared him to his colleagues.

Mrs. Gathings joins me in extending sympathy to his daughter, Mrs. Gladys Pickens of Magnolia, Ark., and to his grandchildren.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the subject of the passing of Wade Kitchens, Sr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES IN THE CASE OF MINING

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's

table the bill H.R. 4665 relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, KEOGH, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and UTT.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. HANSEN of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, August 24, 1966, the House of Representatives considered and acted upon the conference report on H.R. 14596, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

Due to a conflicting commitment, I was not present during the consideration and action upon the conference report. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

A PLEA TO THE PROFIT TAKERS

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, when we of this 89th Congress passed the GI bill, it was our hope that a great opportunity could be provided for veterans who now serve their country so unselfishly in these difficult days. However, Mr. Speaker, we are finding from many cold war GI returnees in the Rocky Mountain States the development of a pattern that is most disturbing. Home vendors in these difficult times because of the tight money policies, because of climbing interest rates, are apparently placing one price on a house to an ordinary buyer and a second price on the house when a cold war veteran tries to buy it on GI financing.

Sellers attempt to justify this double standard by saying that a high dividend must be paid by the seller; also stating that without larger downpayments the overall price must be increased somewhat. Mr. Speaker, while this, of course, is brought on in part by the unreasonably high rates these days, all of it does remind me of Abraham Lincoln's tearful observations upon the men taking too high and too fat a profit during the Civil War:

Where the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered!

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL VOTE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected to show that I did not vote "yea" and rollcall No. 234 on August 22, 1966.

I was out of the city and did not vote on the motion to recommit H.R. 16340, though the Record reports that I voted for the motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE PLANES ARE IN THE AIR

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, after 6 weeks of idleness, five major airlines are once more in operation; their planes are in the air; passengers, air freight, and mail are speeding to their respective destinations; wages are accruing to the credit of thousands of employees; revenues are flowing into the coffers of the various companies. Nobody lost this strike; nobody was penalized; nobody was coerced; nobody was victimized; nobody lost face. The good old American system of free enterprise, free bargaining, and settlement of differences by negotiation has once again been vindicated. It works. Without passing judgment on the merits or demerits of the terms of settlement, it is fair to say that everybody concerned gained stature during the struggle.

Almost at the start, the House Commerce Committee was thrust into the vortex of the storm. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the courage and determination of the members of this committee. They were buffeted by the winds of advice and demand from every quarter of the economic and political environment. The pressure kept up without intermission for days. But they took no counsel of hysteria, or panic, or exasperation.

On the contrary, they pressed on with unwavering steadiness and irresistible patience toward a settlement. Throughout the negotiations, they comported themselves, to a man, in the finest traditions of responsible American statesmanship. I am proud to be a member of this committee. Its courage and judgment have been tried in the hot fires of contention, and proved to be the real mettle.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 238 I am recorded as voting "nay." I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WHEN WILL SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT STRANGE McNAMARA DEVOTE HIS FULL ATTENTION TO THE WAR IN VIETNAM?

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when will Secretary of Defense Robert Strange

Lankford, Carson W., OF103866.
Lippincott, William R., Jr., OF102781.
McCullum, Tommie L., OF104488.
Metelko, James E., OF102554.
Moore, Julius B., Jr., OF102684.
Nadal, Rafael L., OF104504.
Nichols, Robert A., OF102578.
O'Neill, Peter G., OF104510.
Parker, Charles M., OF103000.
Pennypell, Johnson E., OF103067.
Plymale, Charles F., OF103071.
Poff, Gary L., OF103009.
Prather, Thomas L., Jr., OF100608.
Putman, Gerald H., OF101884.
Ruppenthal, Harry L., OF103721.
Straub, Delbert M., OF105558.
Tysdal, Thomas P., OF103757.
Wilkins, Harold H., OF103776.
Wittbrodt, Thomas A., OF103781.
Wood, Smythe J., OF103783.
Woulfe, Robert J., OF103785.
Young, Leo M., OF105601.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps
Mumma, Patrick J., OF102989.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Winfree M. Abernethy Allan E. Berg
Dennis M. Achilles Craig A. Bergman
Carl P. Ackerman Gordon C. Berryman
Chauncey C. Acrey III
Carl I. Adams Coy T. Best, Jr.
Charles N. Adams Thomas N. Best, Jr.
Larry G. Adams George R. Bettie
Wayne T. Adams Lance V. Bevins
John R. Ahern Abraham Bevis
Paul J. Albano Richard L. Blanchino
David G. Amey Ronald J. Biddle
Andrew G. Anderson Noel C. Bing
II Max D. Bishop
Donald F. Anderson Robert A. Black, Jr.
John M. Anderson Clifford G. Blasi
Larry R. Anderson Patrick J. Blessing
Peter P. Anderson Bradley W. Bluhm
Donald K. Angel Michael A. Blunden
Fred W. Anthes Carl E. Bockewitz
John T. Archer Wichard H. Bode, Jr.
David A. Arthur Henry C. Bollman III
William C. Asbury Latham Boone III
Thomas D. Ashe Andre M. Bordelon
Dennis M. Atkinson Michael O. Boss
Douglas W. Austin John J. Bowe, Jr.
Clair E. Averill, Jr. John W. Boyan
Allan F. Ayers III Thornton Boyd
Wayne A. Babb Gerald P. Brackin
Larry A. Backus Christopher M. Bradley
Charles L. Bacon Clinton E. Braly
Maurice S. Bacon Walter J. Breede III
Kenneth E. Bailey John F. Brennan
Allan P. Bakke Patrick J. Brennan
Richard C. Bannan Thomas V. Brennan,
Emory W. Baragar Jr.
Boyd L. Barclay Anthony D. Brewin
Richard K. Bardo Roger S. Bride
Brent J. Barents Lloyd G. Brinson, Jr.
Richard T. Barker Harold L. Broberg
William G. Barnes, Jr. David W. Brown
Blanton S. Barnett III Gary E. Brown
Henry D. Barratt Raul B. Brown
John J. Barrett Robert D. Brown
Peter L. Barth Robert W. Brown, Jr.
Merrill L. Bartlett Robert A. Browning
Robert O. Bartlett Curtis B. Bruce
Francis J. Barton Clay A. Brumbaugh
John F. Bates Robert L. Brutke
Harry C. Baxter, Jr. Frederick T. Bryan
Dale S. Beaver George S. Burgett
Duard "L." Beebe Charles O. Burke
James R. Beery Alan L. Burnaford
Thomas M. Beldon Arthur E. Burns III
Donald R. Bell, Jr. Donald E. Burns
John R. Bell Thomas V. Burns
George E. Bement Ronald G. Burnsteel
Benjamin E. Benjamin Bruce Burrows
Joseph J. Bennett III Peple M. Burton, Jr.
Ronald D. Bennett Roland E. Butler
William H. Bennett Robert W. Byrd
Jerome H. Bentley III Michael "J." Byron
Roderick E. Benton William L. Cadieux

Chester C. Calkins, Jr.
Richard D. Camp, Jr.
Gary E. Carlson
James E. Carlton, Jr.
Peter D. Carpenter
Jimmy M. Carson
Frederick H. Carter
Kenneth L. Carter
Thomas C. Carter
John B. Caskey
David J. Cassidy
Henry B. Castle
Paul R. Catalogne
Ronald D. Cater
Leon G. Chadwick,
III
Robert C. Champion,
Jr.
James M. Chance
Kurt J. Chandler
Lonnie S. Chavez
Charles W. Cheatham
Stanley W. Cheff, Jr.
Louis E. Cherico
Jack A. Chlaramonte
Douglas S.
Christensen
Duel D. Christian
William H. Christoph
Jorel B. Church
Theodore C. Cleplik,
Jr.
Joseph B. Clancy
James A. Clark
Joe Clark
Robert F. Clark
Roger J. Claus
Charles D. Clausen
William C. Clay, III
Harry F. Clemence,
Jr.
Robert F. Clemmons
David W. Clingman
Michael E. Cochran
Richard V. Coffel
Richard W. Coffman
William E. Cole II
Michael H. Collier
Ernest E. Collins
Bernis B. Conatser, Jr.
Ronald J. Condon
Thomas M. Conley
James E. Connell
Charles E. Conway, Jr.
John J. Conway
Thomas C. Corbe
David C. Corbett
Ronald C. Cormier
Jerry L. Cornelius
Walter J. Costello
John P. Coursey, Jr.
Harold W. Courter
Paul H. Courtney
Cryspin J. Cowell
David E. Cox
Millard Cox
William F. Cox
Miles H. Crafton, Jr.
Wayne N. Crafton
Richard J. Craig
Robert R. Craig
Marvin L. Creel
William W. Crews
Richard H. Criche
Ronald R. Critser
Albert B. Crosby
Kenneth L. Crouch
Thomas B. Cullen
Paul W. Culwell
"C" "D" Cuny
James E. Curran, Jr.
Edward R. Curtis
James G. Custar
Reid E. Dahart
Joseph C. Dangler
Marshall B. Darling
William D. Davidson
Bruce E. Davis
Donald R. Davis
James A. Davis
James F. Davis
Leroy G. Davis

Roger E. Davis
Patrick E. Dawson
Joseph C. DeBilio
Herbert W. DeGroot
John D. DeHoll
Carmine J. Delgrosso
Angelo C. DeMeo
Arlie W. R. Demien, Jr.
Thomas F. Dempsey
Larry T. Denney
Francis T. Detirey
Thomas P. Devitt
Lawrence G. De Vore
Thompson B. Dickson
William P. Dickson
William M. Diedrich
Roger H. Dingeman
Ernest L. Dinius
Ronald R. Dirck
Elliott S. Dix
Wilson R. Dodge
John W. Dohrman
John T. Dolan
Patrick J. Donnelly
John J. Dougherty
Richard J. Dove
Jack G. Downing
Michael J. Doyle
Robert A. Doyle
Walter B. Dozier
Richard L. Drury
Charles Duffy
Charles J. Duffy
Clay J. Dugas II
Dorris "A." Duncan
Dennis J. Dunlap
David S. Durham
William G. Dwinell
Edward J. Dwyer, Jr.
Joseph M. Dwyer
Joseph J. Dzilecki
Clarence L. Eastwood
Leonard M. Eaton
Ronald R. Eckert
James F. Egan II
James E. Egloff
Helmuth J. Eichhorn
Earl W. Eiland
Paul R. Ek
Steven J. Ek
John H. Ellingson
James F. Ellis
Richard W. Elsworth
John N. Ely
Robert E. Enis
Patrick S. Enright
Brian J. Fagan
James W. Fagan
Rudolph H. Fahrner
Robert J. Faught
Paul I. Faulkenberry
Joseph M. Favus
Harold T. Fergus
Robert L. Ferguson,
Jr.
Roger G. Ferguson
James D. Field
Peter B. Field
Frank A. Finizio
John T. Fischbach
James A. Fisher
Thomas M. Flattery
Victor K. Fleming, Jr.
Stephen T. Flynn
Elbert A. Foster
Wayne N. Fowler
Donald R. Frank
Douglas R. Frank
Howard A. Franz
David L. Fraser
Richard A. Frindt
Robert D. Fulcher
Richard F. Fullerton
Harold F. Gabelman
Sidney R. Gale
Samuel J. Galloway
Joel R. Gardner
Barry L. Garner
James D. Garrett
Albert R. Gasser, Jr.
Ronald L. Gatewood
Charles R. Geiger

John M. Geisser
Robert J. Genovese
Aultie G. Gerwig
Michael P. Getlin
Michael R. Getsey
Larry R. Gibson
Bobby G. Girvin
Aloys A. Glose
Robert H. Goetz
Paul B. Goodwin
Henry F. Gotard
Bernard Grabowski
James A. Graham
Donald A. Grant
Peter C. Grauert
Edwin T. Gray
Robert W. Green
William R. Green
Joseph P. Greaves, Jr.
Simon H. Gregory
Tommy D. Gregory
Donald A. Gressly
Marshall M. Grice, Jr.
Alfred L. Griggs
Jackie L. Grinstead
Steven J. Groebner
Paul G. Grummon
Leon A. Guimond
Gordon H. Gunniss
Michael A. Gurrola
Thomas M. Haddock
John F. Hales
Hurston Hall
Samuel T. Hall
James C. Hallman
George C. Hamilton
William P. Hamilton
Thomas L. Hampton
Joseph J. Hanley
James H. Hanson
William T. Hardaker,
Jr.
Christian L. Harkness
Michael H. Harper, Jr.
John F. Harrah
John D. Harrill, Jr.
William G. Harris, Jr.
John C. Harrison
William L. Hartley
Jude M. Hartnett
Stanley E. Haynes
James D. Hayslip
William L. Heflin
Ronald A. Helntz
Hans R. Heinz
Jerry G. Henderson
Kenneth S. Hendrick-
son
Stuart L. Henning
Jerry L. Henson
James R. Herd
Donald H. Hering
Walter H. Herkal, Jr.
Jerome L. Hess
Francis E. Heuring
Bruce B. Hickox
Billie E. Hicks
Kent R. Hildreth
Nicholas J. Hilgert, Jr.
Fred P. Hilpert, Jr.
Thomas F. Hinkle
Amos B. Hinson III
Alan W. Hitchens
Harold M. Hitt
Daniel A. Hitzelberger
Robert W. Hobbs
James V. Hoekstra
John W. Hogue
Vernon J. Holbrook
Alwin G. Holland, Jr.
Bobby G. Hollings-
worth
James A. Hollis
Kenneth L. Holm
Hal Holmes, Jr.
Franklin J. Homan II
Richard J. Hooton, Jr.
Keith D. Hornbacher
Gerald L. Hornick
John A. House II
Otis E. Howard III
Thomas M. Howard

Thomas M. Howlett
Robert W. Hubbard
Charles R.
Huddleston
Walter F. Hudburg,
Jr.
William E. Hudson
Norbert A. Huebsch,
Jr.
Ronald H. Huesman
Benjamin M. Huey II
Robert A. Hughes
Winston L. Hughes
Richard C. Hult
Bruce A. Hultman
Gerald Hunt
Robert A. Hutchins,
Jr.
Delbert M. Hutson
Donald K. Igou
Raymond F. Incoctati
William W. Jackson
Bronson C. Jacoway,
Jr.
Fred L. James
James J. Jaros
James T. Jenkins
Gilbert D. Johnson
Herbert C. Johnson
Kenneth H. Johnson
Thomas L. Johnson.
Ward S. Johnson
Harlan E. Jones
Jack L. Jones
Patrick S. Jones
Richard C. Jones, Jr.
Robert L. Jones, Jr.
Robert E. Jones
William D. Jones
Charles G. Jordan
Robert W. Joyce
Charles D. Joyner
Norman G. Jungmann
Kenneth E. Junkins
Gerard T. Kalt
Dennis W. Kane
Richard J. Kapsch
Gerald R. Keast
Elton J. Keeley
Thomas P. Keenan, Jr.
William F. Keller
John A. Kelly
John A. Kelly
Edmund W. Kelso, Jr.
Rodney P. Kempf
James A. Kenniger
Richard B. Kenyon
John P. Kerchner
Allan K. Kerins
Theodore J. Keskey
Eugene W. Kimmel
Steven B. Kimple
John T. King
Robert N. Kingrey
Michael P. Kingston
William G. Kingston,
Jr.
George W. Kirby
Thomas W. Kirby
Hague M. Kiser
John W. Kiser, Jr.
Francis T. Klabough
Alfred S. Kline
John E. Knight, Jr.
Edward A. Kolbe
Anthony F. Konopka
William E. Konrath
Frank H. Kos, Jr.
Gerald W. Kozak
Paul F. Kramer
Dennis E. Kraus
Larry A. Krohn
Leonard R. Krolak
Peter A. Kugel
Lawrence C. Kutchma,
Jr.
Thomas A. La Cour
Ellis E. Laitala
Harry E. Lake, Jr.
Gary K. Lambert
Timothy A. Lamphier
Carlton E. Land

August 25, 1966

19785

But even if there is to be a long and sizable war rather than a phase one struggle, only such a Government could make South Vietnam an effective partner in waging and winning it. And if there is, after all, a negotiated settlement, only such a government could absorb the disciplined cadres of the Vietcong, whether as a recognized political body or as unreconciled revolutionaries.

A GOOD TURNOUT NEEDED

In the shorter run, the Sept. 11 elections also could prove important in themselves if, in the face of what is expected to be a determined Vietcong effort to disrupt and stifle the voting, there is a sizable turnout—say, something like half of those eligible.

That would indicate that the Vietcong do not control as much of the populace as many believe. And it would suggest that a large number of South Vietnamese believe enough in a future for their country to take a hand in shaping it—despite terrorism on the one hand and mistrust of the Saigon generals on the other.

AN ALL-ASIAN PEACE CONFERENCE: AN IDEA WORTH FOSTERING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the idea of an all-Asia Peace Conference to bring about a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam conflict is an idea worth fostering—despite the fact that Hanoi and Peking have initially rejected it. The initiator of this idea, Charles Percy, of Illinois, is to be commended. The value of this initiative is demonstrated by the fact that many persons intimately concerned with foreign affairs have risen to support it. Most notable among them are: Thanat Khoman, Thailand's Foreign Minister, ex-President Eisenhower and former Vice President Nixon, a number of Senators and Congressmen from both parties, and as recently as yesterday, President Johnson.

Though there may be little likelihood in the foreseeable future for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, this does not relieve us of the responsibility of seeking peace by all possible means. Even though Peking, Hanoi, and the National Liberation Front refuse to talk about anything but total South Vietnamese and U.S. concessions, our unconditional offer of peace talks must stand. Only by doing so, can we convince the world that our intentions are honorable.

I have always maintained that the best way to solve regional problems is by the regional approach, and I have argued that regionalism represents the most vital kind of reality in contemporary international affairs. For, regionalism is the most productive and acceptable way for nations with common problems and objectives to join their resources and energies into a common effort.

Beginnings of regionalism are already apparent in Asia. Three such groupings are of particular importance. First, there is the Asian Bank, a project which has been enthusiastically received by Asian and Western countries alike. The Asian Bank with an initial capitalization of \$200 million for the first year will be an ongoing operation as of January 1967. Its full acceptance by Asians indicates that it will be only a first step in the direction of greater economic cooperation.

A second Asian grouping, one that is being revitalized, is the Association of Southeast Asia, composed of Thailand,

Malaysia, and the Philippines. This small grouping intends to extend its cooperation to all enterprises—political, economic, military, and technical. There has been much talk of late about the possibility of Indonesia joining this group. If this occurs, it could be the beginning of a solid and lasting nucleus for wider Asia cooperation.

The third, a newly organized Asia and Pacific Council—composed of South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Republic of China, Malaysia, South Vietnam and Laos as an observer—may well be the precise instrument and organization through which to implement the idea of an all-Asian peace conference for Vietnam. If ASPAC's first meeting in Seoul, Korea, is any indication of what this body can do and of what it intends to do, it may develop into a regional organization capable of dealing with regional security matters without direct U.S. participation. It may if nurtured, instead of being pushed into any rigid ideological framework, be the means of bringing peace to Vietnam.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11 and 29 to the bill and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to

the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 13, and 27 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 24 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 13298. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts; and

H.R. 14596. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 O'CLOCK A.M.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Friday, August 26, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 25, 1966:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. McSweeney, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bulgaria.

Miss Carol C. Laise, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Nepal.

Leo G. Cyr, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Rwanda.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be majors

Lewis, Robert G., O64369.
Stewart, Wilmer D., O70516.
Wallace, William B., O64662.
Waller, Ephraim E., OF102287.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Cowan, Charles E., Jr., OF103818.
Craig, Richard P., OF100157.
Dahoney, Richard H., OF102445.
Edwards, William J., OF192861.
Fredrick, Gilbert H., Jr., OF102876.
Hadaway, Bobby G., O97126.
Hand, David E., O95391.
Jagielski, James R., OF104455.
Jarrett, Garnett L., OF105441.
Kelley, Erskine H., 3d, OF104463.
Kelley, Lawrence O., OF103860.
Krumholz, Harvey R., OF103401.
LaFreniere, Richard L., OF105457.

"Therefore, I am today introducing a bill to establish a National Commission on Public Management. My bill is cosponsored by Senators DOMINICK, ALLOTT, BENNETT, CASE, FANNIN, JAVITS, KUCHEL, MORTON and TOWER. A companion measure is being introduced today in the other body by Representative MORSE of Massachusetts and more than 40 of his colleagues.

"This Commission would bring to bear on the management of public business the very best minds in private industry, government, labor and education. Its mandate is to answer two fundamental questions: can new management technology aid us in solving public problems? What is the best way to do the job?

"This bill proposes that a National Commission be appointed by the President in order to study and recommend the manner in which modern systems analysis and management techniques may be utilized to resolve national and community problems in the non-defense sector.

"The Commission would be composed of a Chairman, Vice Chairman and eleven other members, who shall be experienced in the subject matter to be studied by the Commission, and shall include representatives from government, business, labor and education. In addition, the Commission may appoint an Executive Director and any other staff personnel required.

"The Commission would have an active life of approximately two and one half years. At the end of one year it would provide the President and the Congress with a preliminary report including a precise description of the problems, a preliminary analysis of the applicability of these new management techniques to a wide spectrum of public problems, and a detailed plan for continuing study leading up to the final report. Then, 18 months later, the Commission would submit its final report, containing explicit plans, including case examples, for applying particular management technology to specific public problems. This report would also contain recommendations for legislation, Federal executive action, and State and local governmental action needed to facilitate the application of these techniques.

"The Commission would study and investigate the following major areas:

"1. Definition of those social and economic problems to which the application of the 'systems approach' appears to hold promise.

"2. Analysis of the many modern management techniques currently being used in the aerospace field to determine those which are best suited for application in the non-defense sector and what modifications may be required.

"3. An assessment of the proper relationship between governmental and private investment in these areas, including the degree of public involvement and the best procedures for government support and funding.

"4. An assessment of the optimum organizational relationships among several levels of governmental authorities.

"5. The role of small business and organized labor in the application of these new management techniques.

"6. An assessment of potential contributions of the universities toward resolving public management problems.

"The tasks of management in both public and private enterprise have become more complex due to the very nature of the problems inherent in a dynamic society such as ours, and due, of course, to advances in science and technology. The problems of managing even the largest Federal programs of a generation ago were small compared to those of today. All levels of government—Federal, State and local—are finding it increasingly difficult to solve their complex management problems on a piecemeal basis, to a large extent because they lack the management techniques and skills that have been applied so successfully in private industry.

"Although there are studies in process dealing with the use of systems analysis in several non-defense areas, the questions of where and how the systems approach is most applicable and the problems as to how these can best be applied are still largely unanswered. Those questions require the attention of a Commission, appointed by the President, to include the best minds in the field of modern management technology.

"Some of our distinguished colleagues have recently introduced legislation which would authorize the expenditure of public funds, either directly by Executive Departments or through grants to the States, for contracts with universities or other organizations which would attempt to apply the systems analysis approach to public problems. We fully support our colleagues on the basic issue of stimulating governmental support for such endeavors, but we also believe that a national commission is required first to provide the overall analysis and informed recommendations needed by all governmental authorities who may have reason to use the systems approach in the future.

"The significance of the proposal goes far beyond the mere application of systems management and the new technology. The Commission would be the first step in a major new political departure. What is envisioned is the application by private industry of these new problem solving techniques to public policy problems. By utilizing the vital skills of private industry, under contract to the government, it is possible at the same time to solve these increasingly complex problems and to attack informatively the great problems presented by the constant burgeoning of the Federal Government in its multifarious aspects."

RIGHTS, LEADERS AND MARCHES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "Rights, Leaders and Marches," which appeared in the August 23 edition of the Washington Daily News.

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

RIGHTS, LEADERS AND MARCHES

A half-dozen leaders of rival civil rights organizations appeared Sunday on a national TV show. The experience was not especially instructive, nor necessarily constructive. Most of these men dealt with tactics, rather than goals.

Their views ranged all the way from the realistic appraisal by Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, who thinks progress is at work, even if not fast enough or broad enough, to Stokeley Carmichael of SNICK, as it is called, who would burn down the granary to get at the wheat. Or James Meredith, who talked of Negro vigilantes.

Martin Luther King, leading the daily demonstrations in Chicago, said a court injunction to limit the demonstrations was "unjust, unconstitutional and immoral." He implied he might obey it only temporarily.

The court restricted the demonstrations to one at a time, to daylight hours, to 500 marchers and required the demonstrators to give 24-hour notice.

In the circumstances, this was a judicious limitation. Dr. King says the only purpose of demonstrations is to "bring issues out into the open," and with the public attention he gets one parade can do as much as a dozen.

But the Chicago marches have been marked by fierce violence. There is no logic or excuse in this, but it puts a heavy load on police. The court limitation is in protection of the marchers.

Moreover, these marches in business streets disrupt traffic, hampering the normal opera-

tions of those who live in the areas. These people at least deserve reasonable notice of the disruption. Rights are for all, not just some, which is the principle Dr. King is trying to prove.

These leaders could help their cause by more resort to persuasion, education, persistence and devotion to goal rather than tactic; by being less abrasive, less menacing. They have made their point; excesses could blunt it.

ACTUAL FIGURES ON NEGRO-WHITE ECONOMIC LEVELS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a column by Bruce Blossat, entitled "Actual Figures on Negro-White Economic Levels," which appeared in the August 19 edition of the Washington Daily News.

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

ACTUAL FIGURES ON NEGRO-WHITE ECONOMIC LEVELS

(By Bruce Blossat)

Stokely Carmichael of the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee seems to be suggesting, in recent public utterances, that most whites are comparatively well off and nearly all Negroes are poor.

This generalization, if he intends his comment to be that, represents a vast and misleading over-simplification of white-Negro economic status today.

It obscures the fact that in the last two decades Negroes have made substantial—if still greatly insufficient—economic progress. It also conceals the fact that millions of whites are very poor.

PERCENTAGES

Some social analysts consider a \$6000-a-year family income the entry point into the steadily swelling American middle class. By that measure, about a fourth of the nation's 5 million Negro families today fall into the middle class category.

In 1940 the figure was only 10 per cent. Even as recently as 1950 it was just 16 per cent.

There can be no joy over the fact that this clear progress still leaves 75 per cent of Negro families below middle class levels and 36 per cent of the total below the \$3000-a-year family income plane—in abject poverty.

Yet, tho it cannot be a consolation, it is instructive to note that 40 per cent of the country's 45 million white families are likewise below middle class income levels, and more than 14 per cent of white families below the \$3000 family income mark.

ACTUAL NUMBERS

These percentages, for whites, are much lower, but the numbers are high. Some 3,750,000 Negro families fall short of middle class. So do about 16,250,000 white families. Perhaps 6.5 million white families classify as very poor.

Furthermore, with all the racial ferment in U.S. cities, the notion has taken hold that core-city slums today are almost totally occupied by impoverished Negroes. Housing studies show, however, that of 9 million U.S. households living in squalor, some 6 million are white. The Negro total is 2.3 million, with Puerto Ricans and Mexicans accounting for the rest.

Charges that Negroes are slipping farther and farther behind in the income race with whites do not seem to be supported by government income figures.

In 1947 the U.S. Negro family was earning 51 per cent as much as the typical white family. A decade and a half later, the percentage had risen to 53 per cent. That is

not much "catching up," but neither is it slipping back.

WOMEN'S GAINS

Income gains for Negro women workers account for the modest advance, since male Negro workers have held steady at around 55 to 57 per cent of white male workers' income.

What holds the Negroes' income down is the sharp pay differential between Negro and white workers doing the same jobs. Moreover, the proportionately older white population has many more people in their middle-range peak earning years than does the young Negro population.

And, of course, the far higher Negro unemployment rate, especially among teen-agers, severely aggravates this situation.

Catching up obviously depends partly on finding millions more jobs for Negroes and partly on their elevation into more skilled and professional jobs—at pay levels commensurate with whites.

Nevertheless, median family income for all Americans, white and Negro, rose roughly 45 per cent from 1947 to 1963 and is still climbing. The Negroes' substantial share in this advance explains why more and more of them continue, slowly but surely, to move into the American middle class. They are far from income parity with whites, but they are on a persistently rising income curve.

AN OPEN LETTER TO NEIGHBORS IN SOUTHEAST'S 11TH PRECINCT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter written by a resident of Southeast Washington and addressed to his neighbors in the community. The letter appeared in the August 18 edition of the Washington Daily News.

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

AN OPEN LETTER TO NEIGHBORS IN SOUTHEAST'S 11TH PRECINCT

(The following letter was written by a resident of Southeast Washington, Ken Smith, of 2422 Elvans Road se, addressed to his neighbors in the community.)

I'm poor. I'm not working, even. I'm Negro. I'm a high school drop out. I drink, I smoke and gamble, and I'm a product of a broken home . . . but I'm not a rebel. I love you and my country and community. I love life. I've seen police brutality first hand; but on a larger scale I've seen citizen brutality.

"Coming events cast their shadows before" is one of the truest sayings in the world. And anyone can say "I told you so" after things get out of hand.

But I have a solution to our community problem. It is this:

First remember, regardless of who you are, if you look for trouble you'll find it. Second, each and every one of you, white and colored, stop and think, "What am I as an individual doing for my community, not what is my community doing for me?" Are you guilty of hanging on corners, creating a nuisance to passers-by with rough language and horseplay? Do you hang outside of the liquor stores waiting for a sponsor to get your head bad on cheap wine and beer?

Do you hang on your front steps looking as unkempt and slovenly as you can? Do you really give a damn where your children are, or only when they are arrested? Do you pull as many as five false alarms on a given week-end night? Do you harass the paper boys who are trying to lift themselves by their bootstraps, and take their pennies?

Did you, in spite, break into the new apartment building and tear things apart,

breaking windows, fixtures, and such? How many windows did you break at Moten School, Birney School? How many rides did you steal on the D.C. Transit buses? How many muggings, party crashings, gangs, rapes and rumbles were you in on?

Did you come home drunk last Friday and curse the neighbors, God and your own family?

What did you do about the dirty apartment fronts on Morris Road and other places? Did you get up and stick the kids on the front porch looking as lost as can be while you caught another nap?

Well, most of us are guilty of some of these things and the solution lies with the individual. He presents his ideas to a group and if his ideas are not right then the group's ideas won't be right if they adopt his.

Don't demand until you are ready to offer. Don't take until you are ready to give.

You are not born free socially, or economically. You are born free spiritually and it behooves each and every one of you to put forth the effort to be free socially and economically. Youth is no excuse any more than age or educational ignorance because we all know what hurts us and if it hurts us it hurts others also.

So get off the street corners and stoops, get into the churches, Y's, community centers and the like. Hold your heads up, look all men in the eye and say I am as good as you because I act it.

Just like the rioter's way of living leads to early death and destruction, so does the rioter's way of asking for help lead to death of ideals and incentive and programs.

Don't let Chicago and Watts and Detroit and Philadelphia be your guideline or example. "To thine own self be true."

Remember this: orderly dissent is legal, it is soul-searching, and it is productive. But remember that "united we stand divided we fall" means united in decency and purpose to achieve the Utopia we all wish for.

VIETNAM: SOME UNVARNISHED FACTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in an article which was published in the New York Times on August 24, Tom Wicker makes an important contribution to shedding light on some of the unpleasant, but nevertheless very real facts about Vietnam. Mr. Wicker's article takes almost precisely the position and analysis on Vietnam which I myself have been making for over a month.

There is little likelihood of a Vietnam settlement in the foreseeable future by either a peace conference or a series of decisive military victories. Even when our military force becomes predominant in South Vietnam, when the Communists discover that it is not militarily feasible for them to operate in large units, it is likely that they will revert to stage one, or the guerrilla stage of Mao Tse-tung's theory of guerrilla war. This, in turn, points up the real challenges of its insurgency warfare, the real limitations of force as the only solution to defeating guerrillas.

The main role of force should be to provide a shield of confidence behind which the equally real war against social and economic deprivation can go forward. It is at the ballot box, through the process of legitimizing government, and through the worth of the daily lives of the people that a guerrilla war is won or lost.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Wicker's article printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BALLOT BOX BATTLEFIELD

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, August 23.—Reports from South Vietnam now indicate somewhat fewer combat incidents involving large North Vietnamese units and somewhat more guerrilla and terrorist attacks than might have been expected.

On its face, this could suggest that North Vietnam and the Vietcong, discouraged at the American force and firepower in the field against them, are reverting to the so-called "phase one" of a war of national liberation—terror, assassination, intimidation and political infiltration, waged by small bands in the countryside.

THE ADMINISTRATION

This is not accepted here. Administration officials—particularly the military—are inclined to think instead that the "spoiling tactics" of American troops have been successful enough to keep the opposition's main force units off balance and unable to develop anything like a general offensive.

Thus, guerrilla incidents make more of a splash than they might otherwise. In addition, the forthcoming South Vietnamese elections probably have provoked increased terrorism as the insurgents seek to disrupt the campaign and render the voting as meaningless as possible.

Finally, infiltration from the north continues at a high level, which would hardly be the case if there were any intention in Hanoi to pull back its main force units.

Nevertheless, a growing number of American officials no longer expect to see the Vietnamese war liquidated over a green baize conference table, or in some climactic series of military confrontations.

HITTING THE SUPPLY LINES

Their view is that powerful and mobile American forces are demonstrating their ability to cope with large North Vietnamese battle units and that Hanoi eventually will recognize that it has little chance to win a clash of armies. Moreover, to the extent that the American bombing in the north affects the Communist ability to fight in the south, it is the big main force units whose supply and replacement channels are hardest hit.

Since it is virtually a unanimous belief within the Administration that Hanoi nevertheless shows no indication of either giving up that struggle or seeking a negotiated settlement, the conclusion of many officials is that logic probably will dictate an ultimate lapse into phase one.

Such a reversion to hit-and-run guerrilla tactics, with small, mainly native bands ravaging the countryside and terrorizing the people, would limit the big American units to their lowest level of effectiveness.

It would make American bombing in the north even more meaningless militarily than many believe it already is. And if such a development suggested to the American people that the war was subsiding to manageable levels, it might produce far more potent pressures on President Johnson to "bring the boys home."

If that is to be the war's future, all the more importance must be attached to the development of a stable, popular, broad-based government in South Vietnam—a process that could have its beginning in the elections Sept. 11, when an assembly to write a constitution will be chosen.

This is because a new phase one struggle obviously would return much of the burden of the war to South Vietnam—and only an able and respected government, dealing fairly and effectively with its people, is likely to cope with a determined insurgency that has some support in the populace.

McNamara devote his full attention to the war in Vietnam?

I ask this question because of his latest venture into the so-called war on poverty. Apparently, since the Johnson administration's designated antipoverty agency has botched the job, the latest ploy is to divert taxpayer dollars supposedly going for the defense of our Nation into a military poverty war, where, in true McNamara style, the expenditures and the results can be classified as secret.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is involved in a real war. We are spending billions and billions of dollars supposedly in an effort to win it. McNamara has said he is pleased that the war is called McNamara's war.

When is he going to stop trying to run other operations of the Government and climbing mountains, and do the job he was hired to do? Our fighting men in Vietnam deserve at least a full-time Secretary of Defense, even if he and the President will not let them wage a winning war.

DEFENSE SECRETARY McNAMARA AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has brought to the attention of the House a matter about which I have previously obtained a special order for this afternoon during which I propose to discuss the dangerous proposal of the Secretary of Defense to train additional personnel who do not presently qualify for physical or various other reasons to serve in the Armed Forces. The proposal raises many questions which should be resolved before implementation. We must proceed with caution and not allow the military to depart or stray from their purpose.

BILL TO INCREASE TRANSPORTATION TAX 5 PERCENT

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to establish a commercial aviation development trust fund to pay for a portion of the costs involved in developing new commercial aircraft such as the supersonic transport, the cost of which is estimated to run in excess of \$4 billion. The legislation would create the trust fund by increasing the Federal tax on commercial air travel from 5 percent to 10 percent. This would raise approximately \$140 million per year. It is contemplated that the trust fund would bear a portion of the cost of developing the supersonic transport with the remaining cost paid out of the Federal Treasury.

There is no justification for requiring the general taxpaying public to assume the total burden of developing supersonic transport planes which only a small portion of the public can be expected to use. Certainly the regular air

traveler should pay a higher proportionate share of the cost of developing commercial aircraft which will permit him to travel at higher speeds and at greater luxury.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that one way or another we should proceed with the development of the best kind of commercial aircraft. However, public support for this program can only be assured if there is an increased contribution by the regular air traveler who will enjoy most of the special benefits.

The proposed commercial aviation trust fund is patterned after the highway trust fund under which the Interstate Highway System is currently being developed. The user tax principle has worked admirably to develop an interstate system which is the finest in the world. There is no reason why it should not work equally as well in bringing about necessary improvements in commercial air travel.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN GOODS FROM LOW-WAGE AREAS CAUSES INJURY TO AMERICAN EMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to injury caused American employment by the importation of foreign goods from low-wage areas. This legislation will be a basis for hearings my Labor Subcommittee has scheduled, beginning next week, into this area.

The intent of the original minimum wage legislation is clearly outlined in section 2 of the act. My bill does not depart from this intent but, in fact, amplifies it. The framers then recognized the threat of severe wage disparities in market competition. They further recognized the power of Congress to appropriately regulate the flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations. The sum and substance of the intent was, and has been, to protect the economic health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers. This has been effectively carried out in commerce among the States, but severely neglected in commerce between our Nation and others.

To provide a partial remedy for this situation, my bill asserts the responsibility of the Secretary of Labor to recognize the suffering of workers and communities because of wage imbalances. It likewise provides a vehicle for workers, and any other interested party, to bring Federal attention to resulting unemployment and community hardship. Once this attention is focused, and there indeed exists a problem, the bill empowers the President to take whatever action he deems appropriate to alleviate it. This action is in addition to any other customs treatment provided by law. We do not, therefore, infringe upon the established practices of trade or the authority of certain bodies to regulate that trade. We only provide an additional safeguard

to assist those directly, immediately, and adversely affected by imbalances in a factor of production.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this bill to the House for consideration on the part of all Members. From the legislative standpoint, my subcommittee will commence extended, in-depth hearings next week.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollicall No. 237, a quorum call taken earlier today, I am recorded as not answering to my name.

I would have been in the Chamber and responding when my name was called, but I was at the White House attending a bill-signing ceremony.

The legislation which became law today relates to the transportation, sale, and handling of animals which will be used in laboratory experimentation. I have been keenly interested in this legislation and have introduced a bill to regulate the abuses in this field. I am pleased that it has been signed and is now the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that the Journal and permanent Record could be corrected accordingly.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

	[Roll No. 240]	
Andrews,	Hungate	Rivers, S.C.
Glenn	Irwin	Rooney, N.Y.
Baring	King, N.Y.	Roudebush
Boiling	Krebs	Schisler
Broomfield	Landrum	Schmidhauser
Brown, Calif.	Leggett	Scott
Callaway	Long, La.	Senner
Celler	Long, Md.	Shipley
Cohelan	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Conyers	McMillan	Thomas
Craley	Martin, Ala.	Toll
Cramer	Martin, Mass.	Tuten
Evins, Tenn.	Moeller	Walker, Miss.
Flynt	Morrison	White, Idaho
Foley	Murray	Whitener
Fulton, Tenn.	O'Brien	Willis
Hagan, Ga.	Pool	Zablocki
Hansen, Wash.	Powell	
Harvey, Mich.	Rivers, Alaska	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Aug. 24, 1966.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from

Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we have for consideration today the conference report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year which began on July 1, 1966.

Some have asked why this bill is being presented to the floor at so late a date. I would like to give the chronology with respect to the pending legislation.

The President's budget including the request for defense appropriations was presented to Congress on January 24 of this year. Authorization was considered by the House and by the Senate of that portion of the bill which requires authorization. Finally, the authorization conference report was adopted on July 12. The Committee on Appropriations marshaled its forces and sought to bring the bill to the House as soon as there was authority to do so, the President having

signed the authorization legislation on July 13.

So, following enactment of authorization on July 13 we brought this bill to the floor on July 19 for consideration. It passed the House on July 20. It went to the other body and it passed the other body on August 18.

The conference met on August 23, and here we are, on August 25, considering the conference report. In other words, it would have been impossible for the House of Representatives to have considered this legislation in the first instance prior to July 13, and it was considered on July 19.

I should like to speak briefly about what is actually in the conference report. The report is below the House version by \$548 million and it is below the Senate version by \$122 million. The comparisons by title and by department are as follows:

Summary of appropriations

[In thousands]

Item	1966 appropriations	1967 budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1966 appropriations	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I, military personnel	\$17,039,491	\$18,675,700	\$19,299,344	\$18,781,044	\$18,731,044	+\$1,691,553	+\$55,344	-\$568,300	-----
Title II, Operation and maintenance	14,973,962	15,675,094	15,722,794	15,697,721	15,703,312	+729,359	+28,227	-19,473	+\$5,600
Title III, Procurement	18,423,400	16,408,200	16,658,000	16,769,800	16,641,800	-1,781,000	+233,600	-16,200	-128,000
Title IV, Research, development, test, and evaluation	6,721,150	6,905,359	6,928,959	6,983,959	6,983,959	+262,809	+78,600	+55,000	-----
Title V, Emergency fund, southeast Asia	1,700,000	(1)	7,348	7,348	7,348	-1,700,000	-----	-----	-----
Title V, Special foreign currency program	-----	(1)	7,348	7,348	7,348	+7,348	+7,348	-----	-----
Total	58,858,003	57,664,353	58,616,445	58,189,872	58,067,472	-790,531	+403,119	-548,973	-122,400
Distribution of appropriations by organizational component:									
Army	15,727,989	16,925,794	17,441,038	17,165,065	17,165,065	+1,437,076	+239,271	-275,973	-----
Navy	17,267,524	16,813,290	16,938,600	16,979,700	16,829,700	-440,824	+13,500	-111,900	-163,000
Air Force	21,298,085	20,686,300	20,965,400	20,774,900	20,805,900	-492,185	+119,600	-159,500	+31,000
Defense agencies/OSD	2,864,405	3,239,059	3,271,407	3,270,207	3,269,807	+405,402	+30,748	-1,600	-400
Emergency fund, southeast Asia	1,700,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-1,700,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, Department of Defense	58,858,003	57,664,353	58,616,445	58,189,872	58,067,472	-790,531	+403,119	-548,973	-122,400

¹ The original budget estimates were submitted in local currency amounts which were equivalent to \$11,975,000. The original amounts were subsequently reduced to \$7,348,000 at the request of the Department of Defense.

The conference amount is below the figures in either the House or the Senate versions of the bill. But to be utterly frank—and we must—the conference amount is above the President's budget in the sum of \$403 million. This results in large measure from the fact that the House has approved certain projects which were not contained in the budget but which were authorized, mind you, in the authorization legislation.

Some of the measures not included in the budget and included in the conference agreement are as follows:

Retaining separate Army National Guard and Army Reserve organizations	\$67,044,000
Retain all 25 Air National Guard heavy aircraft units	4,300,000
Continue B-52 fleet at 600 aircraft	6,000,000
Continue "Claims" as regular annual appropriation	25,000,000
Provide appropriation in lieu of foreign currency appropriation	7,348,000
Additional OH-6A light observation helicopters	19,900,000
One nuclear powered frigate and long leadtime items for a second	150,500,000
Provisions for production capability for the F-12 interceptor aircraft	55,000,000

Procurement of aeromedical transport aircraft	\$16,000,000
Augmentation of Deep Submergence program	2,500,000
Additional funding for Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft	11,800,000

For the manned orbital laboratory—and this House has been strong in supporting space programs in both NASA and the Department of Defense—there is an addition above the budget of \$50 million. The figures generally in the bill for space programs of a military nature total about \$1.7 billion.

For research and development in the field of antisubmarine warfare there is \$7.5 million above the budget.

So these are the areas in which we are above the budget.

I think we can say that with respect to the major provisions in the bill there is considerable unanimity. It is true that in the House version of the bill about \$569 million was included above the budget for the pay of about 108,000 men who had not been budgeted for and who were actually on board at the beginning of the fiscal year, on July 1.

We felt that we should appropriate for the pay of these men. We appropriate for the pay of people in various govern-

ment agencies for the full 12 months; so we felt a budget estimate should have been submitted for this \$569 million, but failing to secure a budget estimate for these funds, the House put the money in the bill.

The other body decided to omit the funds and await a budget estimate. It is true that we have sufficient money in the bill for the pay of all of our military personnel for a major portion of the year, but not for the whole year.

It is true that next February or March we can, in a supplemental bill, provide the necessary money for the pay of these additional men who were on board at the beginning of this fiscal year above the number estimated in the budget.

It is true, in my judgment, that there will be additional men called into the service and that we will likewise have to provide funds for them.

It is generally estimated that a supplemental will be required next year for the pay of personnel and for the continuation of the war in Vietnam—unless it should unexpectedly end—in the sum of \$5 to \$15 billion. Nobody knows the exact figure, but it is going to be a tremendous figure.

While the tabulation of this bill shows that it is \$790 million below the Defense

19812

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 25, 1966

be well for the committee to look into this further.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We would be glad to.

Mr. BATTIN. With the thought in mind of keeping a very modern facility in operation.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We would be glad to take a look at it, and if the gentleman will give us the information we will look at it carefully.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman. I wish to commend the committee and the conferees for the excellent work which they have done. I am concerned about the subject of military housing.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the subject of new housing is deferred under the direction of the Department of Defense, but the committee and the conferees have authorized rental housing which will sort of take care of it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. No, we have not authorized any new rental housing but have continued rental housing that they had in the last bill with 500 additional units for Hawaii, and that is all. There are no new ones in the continental United States.

Mr. McCLORY. With regard to new military housing, that is deferred until next year or some later time?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We reauthorized those deferrals which will expire under the law. They are reauthorized under this bill.

Mr. McCLORY. I sec. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 990

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 990) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In section 612, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$150,000".

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of in-

quiring of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the remainder of the week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan and after consultation with the Republican leadership, it has been agreed that we would meet tomorrow and dispose of two very important conference reports, one being the urban mass transportation conference report and the other the so-called FNMA report, and then we would ask to go over until Monday when we will continue the consideration of the Department of Transportation bill as the first order of legislative business on Monday. We will then continue with the program which will be announced tomorrow for the balance of next week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The rest of the program for next week will be announced tomorrow at the conclusion of business?

Mr. ALBERT. It will be announced tomorrow. The gentleman is correct.

THREAT OF DEPRESSION HAS NO PLACE IN CONSIDERATION OF VIETNAM

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday, August 21 issue of Parade, a part of the Sunday edition of the Washington Post, carried an article under the title, "After Vietnam, What?" and a subtitle, "Will Our Economy Tumble if Peace Comes?"

The article had this to say:

If the United States were suddenly plunged into peace, what would happen to our war-buoyed economy? A staggering \$30 million a day now being poured into the Vietnam war would go begging. Hundreds of companies geared to war production would be disrupted. Thousands of youths now employed by the armed forces would be turned loose on the streets to hunt for civilian jobs.

This fear is not new. Quite some years ago when the head of the agency charged with expanding our facilities so as to be ready for an all-out war with Russia told me as we walked from committee hearings that if he were in charge of Russia and wanted to wreck the economy of the United States, he would declare 5 years of peace. With all of us praying then as we do now for peace, his statement was shocking.

Just think—

He said—

if we were to cancel all war contracts, with the resulting closed factories and unemployment; if we were to call our men in the service back home and have them seeking jobs; if we quit producing and shipping machinery, equipment, and everything else we send to our allies through Mutual Security, financed by the Export-Import Bank and by other means; if civilian industry had to cut out its 20 percent of extra production and that labor was unemployed; if the farmer had no market for the extra 20 percent of his

production which he has built up to support our defense effort, it would wreck our national economy.

With our present national debt, we must keep national income high for we cannot handle our debt any other way.

That man was just as patriotic and just as much for peace as you and I; but the more I analyzed his statement, the more frightening it became. It did appear that if we tried to slow down the then Government programs, we could have an economic crackup; and yet I could not bring myself to acknowledge even to myself that it took a war, or preparation for war, to maintain our material prosperity.

Yet, as I thought further, we had been producing about 15 to 20 percent more to meet the needs of national defense; there had been, as now, a sale for practically anything industry produced. As my friend pointed out, then as now, most labor, turning out that production, had been accustomed to a full workweek, with much overtime; and farmers were then producing about 20 percent more than our normal markets required. They had been accustomed to selling almost anything they could grow.

I could see that the American people had for years enjoyed material prosperity to a greater extent than any people ever before in this or any other nation. We had more cars, more clothes, more and better food, more radios, television sets, more electrical equipment, more of everything that people need or want than any other nation.

With all of us sincerely for peace, I felt it simply could not be that it takes a war, or preparation for war, to continue such prosperity. I was certain in my own mind that there must be some other answer.

After thinking the matter through, it dawned on me that it is not war or preparation for war, as such, which was the basis for our material prosperity; but it was the 15 or 20 percent extra effort our people had been putting forth because of war, or preparation for war, which had resulted in such material prosperity. Thus, I could see that if we could have peace but continue that extra effort, we could maintain our prosperity and be an even richer nation.

In war and preparation for war a large part of our extra effort consumes our raw materials which are destroyed as shells, worn out as military vehicles, planes, equipment, guns, warships, while we increase wear and tear on our railroads and our highways. The extra food and fiber are either given to our allies, or given to them in money with commodities sold to them for the return of our money. Our lands are used to a greater extent, our timber and natural resources are further depleted.

Where the extra effort due to war or preparation for war is the basis for our material prosperity, we end up a poorer country, for our real wealth decreases. However, if only we had peace so we could put forth that extra effort—not in needed defense expenditures which use up our raw materials, but in work that will improve our basic resources, in reforesting our lands, harnessing our streams for electricity, reclaiming our lands through soil conservation, building the highways

August 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19811

Aviation Agency for utilization of the complex for appropriate aviation purposes only if the President so directs.

I feel this represents a major victory for the House position and accomplishes the purposes for which we inserted the amendment.

SECTION 612

Section 612 is a provision which would require notification in advance of any contracts awarded for advance planning, construction, design and architectural services costing \$50,000 or more. The principal was accepted during the conference although the cost figure was raised to \$150,000. This would insure that in any building the cost of which exceeds \$2,250,000, Congress would have prior notification before architectural and engineering contracts were awarded.

SECTION 613

Section 613 of the bill relates to base closures, and is probably the most important provision in this year's bill. As you recall, it requires the Secretary of Defense to make base closure announcements prior to the expiration of 30 continuous days of session of the Congress before congressional adjournment.

I am most pleased to say that the Senate conferees accepted the House version. I think this is a significant feature, and returns to the Congress certain powers which belong in the Congress.

SECTION 614

The conferees added a section to the bill directing the Secretary of Defense to make a further study concerning the desirability of transferring the Defense Language Institute from the Washington, D.C., area to the lands formerly constituting Biggs Air Force Base, Tex., and also directed him to make a study of the demolition of the four existing piers at the Boston Navy Shipyard and the construction of three new piers and related facilities at such shipyard.

The Secretary will be required to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act.

TITLE VI—RESERVE FORCES

There was no difference in the authorization between the House and Senate as it related to Reserve forces.

While I am still not satisfied that the bill provides the essential facilities required by the military services, I am convinced that this is the very best that we could hope to do this year in view of the attitude of the Department of Defense.

I believe we have a sound bill even though an austere one.

I am hopeful that every Member of this great House will support this report.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to my good friend from New York, an outstanding member of our committee.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's very generous comment.

I want to commend him for the outstanding job which he and the other conferees did on this particular legisla-

tion. I refer particularly to the provision in which I had some interest, the Defense Language School.

The gentleman was modest in describing the result of the conference. Not only was the entire House position upheld, but in addition to that, as Members will see, the conference report is almost a verbatim recital of the position of the House and of the committee. Frankly, I do not see how any fair-minded person, reading that statement and the statement of the managers on the part of the House, could possibly come up with any other conclusion.

I do not know what the Defense Department thinks it is going to be able to do next year in restudying this matter. I believe what the conferees have done has been a victory for our defense language capacity. If we had more people in Vietnam who could speak Vietnamese today, I believe our military capacity there would be greatly enhanced. I want to congratulate the gentleman for this fine victory on something that is also essential to our national security.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of our committee [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of our committee.

This is an austere bill. We did give it very close scrutiny when it went before our committee. It is essentially the House bill with some changes. But all in all, this side of the aisle heartily approves the bill and recommends that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report. It is substantially the House bill. We are thoroughly satisfied with it.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, a member of the committee, Dr. HALL.

Mr. HALL. I thank the chairman.

I particularly wish to commend those who have written the report, for such areas as have been mentioned: the Anacostia-Bolling complex decision, and the position the committee has taken, after many subcommittee investigations over there; and the position with respect to Puerto Rico and the Rodriguez General Hospital, vis-a-vis a new one which eventually may be needed. Certainly the other needed to be preserved.

I rise particularly to speak about section 613. There are comments about that section on page 42 of the statement of the managers on the conference report.

To my mind this makes an even stronger and greater legislative record, from which the Department should implement its regulations concerning military construction, and particularly base closure.

This has been a subject of great concern, as the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, of this

important committee knows. It has been close to many of our hearts, because we have been trampled on and hurt by executive actions which have been unilateral.

Certainly if anyone believes even a little in and pays the least mind to this report and to the action of the conferees with respect to section 613 of the bill it will be a new mark in the maintenance of separation of powers and the prerogatives of the legislative branch.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman. We worked out the provision in the bill this year which makes it abundantly clear that the Congress must be advised, while in session, when a base is to be summarily closed by the whims of some transitory Secretary, whomever he may be, today or in the dim and distant future.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. I have a question concerning the section 613 to which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] referred.

Under the Military Construction Authorization Act dealing with base closures, would it be the opinion of the gentleman that when a base is on schedule to be phased out at some time in the future—thinking now of 1967 and 1968, when the base is still in full operation—taking into account the conference report on the appropriation bill that was adopted earlier today and the fact that B-52's are still going to be maintained at a higher level than anticipated by the Department of Defense, under the language now in the conference report before the House, there should be a review of a decision to close the base, which decision was previously made, prior to the adoption of such language?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. No; this would not be retroactive, for any announcement made on any existing base. This is with respect to future announcements and future closings.

Mr. BATTIN. I asked the gentleman the question because the base I have particular reference to is the Glasgow Air Force Base at Glasgow, Mont.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If they have announced the closure, this would not apply. This is for future closures.

Mr. BATTIN. I asked because it is one of the newest bases in the SAC inventory.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Has there been an announcement of closure?

Mr. BATTIN. Yes. I would urge the committee, in the light of our colloquy, to study the matter.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would be glad to have the gentleman give me any information available. We will take that into consideration next year. Who can tell?

Mr. BATTIN. In the present circumstances, considering the fact that the language of the Defense Department appropriation bill kept the B-52 force at a higher level, since that is the squadron at the Glasgow Air Force Base, it might

and the schools we need, and in those things that develop and restore our country—we would end up a richer country.

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the Washington Post article, "After Vietnam, What?" is that if we will only bring that war to a successful end we will be equally or more prosperous and in the long run our country will be a hundred times richer if we only were to put forth the extra effort now going to support the war, on the things we need at home.

Mr. Speaker, we must give to our men in service what it takes to win.

Prosperity or the threat of depression has no place in the consideration of Vietnam.

OPPOSITION TO FIREARMS BILL

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

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, for most of the legislative measures which come before the Congress, the support or opposition from the State of Montana is readily apparent. Montanans take pride in participating in the decisions of their Congressmen and as their representative, I am well instructed.

But, Mr. Speaker, at no time during my tenure as a Congressman from the western district of Montana have I received such an outright command from the citizens of Montana as I have in their opposition to the proposed firearms control legislation.

For nearly 6 years I have strongly and repeatedly expressed my opposition to any Federal gun control laws. I have made my position widely known, both to my good constituents, and to my colleagues in the Congress.

The advocates of the proposed gun control bill are undoubtedly sincere in their endeavor. Their efforts to study the causes of criminal behavior in the United States deserves the broadest applause and acclaim. But I do not believe that the underlying rationale of the bill is valid. I do not believe that the ease with which firearms can be acquired is a significant factor in the prevalence of lawlessness and violent crime in the United States. Experience has shown that criminals can, and do, and will, obtain firearms regardless of restrictions.

The proposed bill attacks the firearm and the legitimate user of the firearms rather than the criminal user of the firearm. Essentially, the proposed bill misses the target of its purpose. In addition, it imposes unnecessary and burdensome restrictions upon the manufacturer, dealer and legitimate user of firearms without necessarily achieving control of crime.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation brings to mind the spectre of the alcoholic prohibition laws which this Nation adopted in the early part of the century. These measures were ill-conceived and impossible to administer. Because the laws could not be administered effectively, the legislation adopted was gradually more and more severe, and the police powers of the Federal Government

had to be more and more expanded. Finally, in a fit of exasperation, Congress threw up its hands and repealed the prohibition laws outright.

Mr. Speaker, I have a genuine fear that this is to be the fate of any gun legislation which the Congress would pass. It is my prediction that if this proposed gun law is enacted, there will be more severe laws to follow, and again the police powers of the Federal Government will be expanded to administer the legislation.

Twenty million legitimate sportsmen would be penalized, while illegal gun traffic among criminals would flourish.

There is a firm and deep-rooted tradition in our history which commands that every American should have the right to keep and bear arms. This concept is expressed in innumerable places, the most noteworthy being the U.S. Constitution itself. It is, indeed, a stalwart principle in annals of the American civilization, and we should not tear it down in a blind attempt to strike out at crime in our country.

THE 1966 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK POINTS TO A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the past month a heavy volume of evidence has appeared to justify the description of the 1966 Captive Nations Week observance as a new high point in this annual event. In so many respects the recent week has surpassed all previous observances, extending back to 1959 when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution. Beyond question of doubt, this is a good and solid omen of things to come as concern the captive nations in Central-South Europe, the Soviet Union, Asia, and Cuba, Congress' intent to uphold the issue in the basic interests of our national security and that of the free world, and the future development of U.S. foreign policy.

Millions of Americans have shown in this most recent successful observance of Captive Nations Week that they are not being fooled by the superficial and non-essential changes taking place in the Red Empire. The totalitarian Red regimes from Moscow down are solidifying and consolidating their power, not losing hold of it over the suppressed captive nations.

The 1966 observance also demonstrated that large segments of our population are not being fooled by the deceptive Red strategy of "peaceful coexistence." They are very much aware that the Russian-inspired cold war is being waged more intensively than ever in the underdeveloped areas of the world toward the objective of extending the Red Empire further through Communist takeovers. The heavy Russian support of totalitarian Hanoi, with missiles, technicians, and a whole variety of arms used to cut down our own soldiers and planes, was highlighted during the event and advanced as

a firm basis for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Such a committee now would focus world attention on the Red Empire and its deep involvement in the aggression against South Vietnam. With the situation becoming more involved in Vietnam, the extent of Soviet Russian, and other empire aid, to the totalitarian Hanoi regime must be publicly examined and properly assessed. A Special House Committee on the Captive Nations would be a most effective means to develop all the implications of this study and to determine required legislation in this new, evolving context.

Mr. Speaker, as a further indication of the scope and variety of the 1966 Captive Nations Week observance, I request that the following selected items be appended to my remarks:

First. The proclamation of Mayor Sedita of the city of Buffalo, N.Y.

Second. The Buffalo Courier Express account on July 18, "Parade Honors Captive Nations" and the Buffalo Evening News accounts of the same day, "Give Meaning to Heritage of Freedom, Paraders Urged" and "Marchers Parade 'Freedom' Flags of Captive Nations."

Third. The July 18 report in the COG of the Rotary Club of Buffalo titled "Freedom Fighter" and the same publication's report of July 25 on the Vietnamese Ambassador's address.

Fourth. A press release issued by the Buffalo Captive Nations Committee.

Fifth. The presentation of His Excellency Dr. Vu Van Thai, at the Rotary Club Captive Nations event.

Sixth. The address of Dr. Nestor Procyk on Captive Nations Week.

Seventh. The article "Buffalo Kiwanis Observes 'Captive Nations Week'" in the Link publication.

Eighth. The texts of the American Security Council broadcast network during the entire period of Captive Nations Week, featuring among others the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee.

Ninth. A published letter by the executive director of that committee, which conducts the annual observance, Mr. Donald L. Miller:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the aggressive and overtly hostile policies of Russian and Chinese Communists have led to subjugation and enslavement of a large number of once free and independent nations; and

Whereas, ample proof exists that these unwilling captives are desiring liberty and independence from their captors, and have proven time and time again their dissatisfaction with their fate; and

Whereas, the powerful deterrent these nations constitute with their passive as well as active resistance by checking and hampering the grandiose ambitions of the Communist imperialists have been recognized by many experts; and

Whereas, the United States is committed to defend freedom and peace with justice all over the world because by such stand the preservation of our own hard won freedom is being guaranteed; and

Whereas, the freedom aspiring peoples of the Captive Nations know that the United

19814

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 25, 1966

States is the stronghold of human decency with a deep dedication toward helping others to achieve a sovereign life and is willing to aid others at a great cost to her as shown in Viet Nam; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week of July of each year as Captive Nations Week, urging the citizens of our great country to observe said week with appropriate prayers, activities and rallies and expressing their moral support for the just aspirations of captive peoples to attain a full measure of freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Frank A. Sedita, Mayor of the City of Buffalo, do hereby proclaim July 17-24, 1966 as "Captive Nations Week" and call upon the citizens of Buffalo to join with their fellow citizens in observing this week with appropriate prayers for the deliverance of the oppressed and subjugated nations the world over.

FRANK A. SEDITA,
Mayor of Buffalo.

[From the Buffalo Courier Express, July 18, 1966]

PARADE HONORS CAPTIVE NATIONS

County Judge Frederick M. Marshall told an audience in Niagara Sq. Sunday afternoon, following a parade inaugurating Captive Nations Week, that "there is no greater privilege than American citizenship."

The parade featured costumed groups from eight nations which have fallen under the yoke of the Soviet Union. Police estimated 1,500 persons viewed the parade which began at Main and Tupper and proceeded south in Main St. to Genesee St., and west in Genesee St. to the ceremonies at the McKinley Monument.

Judge Marshall noted, "With the privilege of citizenship, however, comes the equal responsibility to understand and defend freedom under our laws."

"Every time you or I show respect for the law and practice good citizenship we give further meaning to the American way of life," Judge Marshall added.

The crowd broke into applause when he said "It is your desire, and that of Americans everywhere, that your loved ones in the Communist countries may be able to taste freedom and liberty."

TIME TO REFLECT

Judge Marshall called the day, "a time for reflection, thanksgiving and a rededication to the principles of democracy."

Dr. Nestor Procyk, assistant director of the West Seneca State School and chairman of the Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week, said "This celebration contributes to a better understanding of the needs of the people behind the Iron Curtain."

H. Buswell Roberts, senior deputy corporation counsel for Buffalo, served as master of ceremonies and introduced Judge Marshall.

Captive Nations week will also be observed at noon Wednesday when John R. Pillion, former representative of the 39th Congressional District, will receive the Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week Freedom Award at a luncheon in the Terrace Room of the Hotel Statler Hilton.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, July 18, 1966]

GIVE MEANING TO HERITAGE OF FREEDOM, PARADERS URGED—JUDGE MARSHALL, DR. PROCYK HELP OPEN CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN NIAGARA SQUARE

The privilege of freedom carries with it the responsibility of respecting the law, participants in opening ceremonies of Captive Nations Week were told Sunday.

"We have become so accustomed to freedom we tend to take it for granted," said County Judge Frederick M. Marshall.

"We bear a responsibility to understand and defend our heritage of freedom under the law.

"Every time you demonstrate respect for the law and encourage good citizenship you give meaning and substance to our American heritage," he asserted.

The observance in front of City Hall, following a parade, marked the beginning of the eighth Captive Nations Week, as proclaimed by Congress in 1959.

Judge Marshall said the hope of all freedom-loving people is that the human rights and dignity of people of Iron Curtain countries will be restored.

Dr. Nestor Procyk, chairman of the local observance, said the captive nations "did not wish to be occupied and ruled by Russia."

"This observance is to remind you that all the people of these nations are enslaved by terror," he said.

Dr. Procyk said besides giving moral support to the captive nations, the observance is a time to announce support of America's stand in Viet Nam.

In endorsing the bombing of North Viet Nam, Dr. Procyk said the "best strategy is to strike the enemy on his own territory."

"However, we must remember that our main enemy is not in Viet Nam but in Moscow."

A proclamation issued by Mayor Sedita called for the citizens of Buffalo to observe the week "with appropriate prayers for the deliverance of the oppressed and subjugated nations the world over."

MARCHERS PARADE "FREEDOM" FLAGS OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

About 400 representatives of eight nations held captive by Russia marched eight blocks to City Hall Sunday in the name of freedom.

The marchers—many dressed in native costumes—carried signs and banners reminding American citizens of the sufferings of their people behind the Iron Curtain.

"Sir, why does that flag have a hole cut in the center?" a woman spectator on the corner of Genesee and Franklin Sts., asked a Hungarian flagbearer.

"In 1956 the Freedom Fighters cut out the symbol of the hammer and sickle on the Hungarian flag to protest their enslavement to Russia," he informed her.

Several of the Captive Nations groups also carried signs supporting the United States' involvement in Viet Nam.

Each country had a story to tell:

Albania and Bulgaria, small Balkan countries which fell to Russia after World War II; Croatia, "fiercely nationalistic people, who have waged strong resistance to Tito's brand of socialism."

Estonia, "independent until invaded by Soviet tanks in an annexation that shook the conscience of the world."

Hungary, whose revolution "sparked public opinion to discussions but too little actions."

Latvia, "unwilling satellite;" Lithuania, formed after World War I, lost in World War II; Ukraine, has "sad distinction of being the first to be overrun by Communist Russian occupants."

[From COG of Rotary Club of Buffalo, July 18, 1966]

FREEDOM FIGHTER

The Mayor's Citizens Committee to observe Captive Nations Week, under the chairmanship of Dr. Nestor Procyk, has invited an outstanding Freedom Fighter, Dr. Vu Van Thai, Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, to give his views on captive nations. This program will be sponsored by the Rotary Club of Buffalo at its regular meeting at 12:00 Noon on Thursday, July 21, in the Golden Ballroom of the Statler Hilton Hotel.

Dr. Vu was born in Hanlo in 1919. He received his high school education in Viet-Nam and further education was completed

in France, with an M.S. degree from the Sorbonne, Paris. In 1954, Dr. Vu returned to Viet-Nam after the Geneva Agreement to join the Vietnamese administration. Resigned from the Government Service in 1961 and joined the United Nations Secretariat. After the fall of President Diem, Dr. Vu returned to Viet-Nam and was appointed Ambassador of Viet-Nam to the U.S., but declined the appointment after the military coup of General Khanh. Reappointed Ambassador of Viet-Nam, Dr. Vu Van Thai presented his letters of credence to President Lyndon B. Johnson on December 16, 1965.

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF JULY 21, 1966

President Bill presided at this distinctive meeting observing "Captive Nations Week".

Earl Sidler, II, Senior Minister of Delaware Avenue Baptist Church, pronounced the Invocation.

All sang the fourth stanza of our National Anthem and Les Erlenbach played the National Anthem of the Republic of Viet Nam.

President Bill welcomed the visitors to our meeting and reminded us of the Sunshine Day activities this afternoon at Cradle Beach Camp, and the dinner at Spooner Smith's Woodbrook Farm in Derby.

Roster Chairman Rog Davis gave No. 2 copy of our new Roster to President Bill. Since the 1966-67 Roster is dedicated to Fenton M. Parke, the No. 1 copy had previously been presented to him in the hospital.

Jim Maxson served as Sergeant-at-Arms and welcomed the most distant traveler, Alberto Berra DiBerra, San Paulo, Brazil, who spoke briefly in Italian.

Among the distinguished guests at the head table was Mayor Frank A. Sedita who spoke briefly and presented our speaker with a Bison statuette, symbolic of the City of Buffalo.

Next President Bill called on Dr. Nestor Procyk, Chairman of the Citizens' Committee to observe Captive Nations Week, who introduced our speaker, His Excellency, Dr. Vu Van Thai, Ambassador to the United States from the Republic of Viet Nam.

Ambassador Thai stated that in the past 25 years, since World War II, Viet Nam has had a constant struggle with colonialism and then communism. Viet Nam came very close to becoming a captive nation, until a few years ago.

The war in Viet Nam is the only open confrontation with communism in Southeast Asia. Burma, The Philippines, and Laos have had and still have problems with communist guerrilla warfare. The conflict in Viet Nam is having a considerable effect on communist policy in other Southeast Asian countries.

A serious contradiction in the communist world between nationalism and international communism has developed with the use of communist China as a challenge of Russia. This contradiction has been accelerated by the Viet Nam struggle.

Ambassador Thai quoted a statement from an official of Singapore that South Vietnamese are dying, not only for their country but also so that the Viet Nam conflict will not be repeated elsewhere.

ED HOFFMAN.

PRESS RELEASE ISSUED BY BUFFALO CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE

Ever since the enactment of Public Law 86-90 in 1959, popularly known as Captive Nations Week, Buffalo has been in the forefront in complying with the provisions of this important law. This year, as in previous years, the week of July 17-24 was marked by activities to promulgate the ideas written into law by giving moral support to the peoples held in Russian or Chinese captivity.

The Week's program started Sunday, July 17, 66 with a parade and motorcade which proceeded to the City Hall. The official civic opening of the Captive Nations Week was

Church and the Communist State of Yugoslavia.

Two other interesting examples are Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Hungary has, of course, dominantly a Catholic people, but it also has large Calvinist and Lutheran Churches. Czechoslovakia has reported now quite a revival of religion. For example, it is now the fashion in Czechoslovakia for a large number of young people to have their marriages celebrated in church. This is a very interesting development which indicates that religion has not lost its vitality and its potential, although it has been—particularly the Catholic part of religion in Czechoslovakia—has been severely persecuted. At one time, for example, there were 1500 priests, at least, in jail. Quite a few, no doubt, have been liquidated. There is now a freeing of a good many of these priests.

The Communist aim is to knock out religion and strangle it, but the tactics and the way of handling depends upon circumstances.

Dr. JUDD. Thank you, Dr. Charles W. Lowry, President of the Foundation for Religious Action.

[Program: 475, Washington Report, July 22, 1966]

CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSAL FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS—DR. JUDD INTERVIEW WITH REP. DANIEL J. FLOOD (D-PA.)

Dr. JUDD. My guest today is my good friend, the Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democratic Congressman from Pennsylvania. Congressman FLOOD is the author of a proposal designed to demonstrate more clearly America's unwavering support of the peoples of Captive Nations oppressed by Communism. Congressman FLOOD, please explain some of the details of your plan to our listeners.

Representative FLOOD. As you know, and as I am glad to tell your audience, the purpose for the Captive Nations Resolution in the House is to bring to the attention of the nation—and always sponsored by the President, whoever he might be, or whatever party—and this is entirely a resolution of both parties. Members of both parties have presented this resolution.

The idea is to establish a special committee on this question of the Captive Nations because we created the phrase; they had been "satellite" nations. Now these people are not "satellites." These are "captive" peoples. And that is the point of distinction. We are trying to point out the importance of establishing, in the House especially, this special committee and the purpose is to point out the pure, naked imperialism and the colonialism of Soviet Russia. The Communists make a point of pointing the finger at democracy, especially the United States, and saying we are colonial and we are imperial. As a matter of fact, this is not true, and the captive nations are held captive by the Soviet. There are many of them; I shall not enumerate them now.

The purpose of the special committee, as you know, and you were one of the sponsors, is to bring to the attention not only of the House and the country and the world the fact that this naked condition of imperialism and colonialism really exists only today in the world in the Soviet Union. And we want to send a bridge across the oceans and the seas and the hemispheres to all of these captive peoples, not only now in the Soviet in Europe and Central Europe, but in the Far East and in the Southeast or wherever they might be in the world.

We believe that the existing established committees do not have the time and cannot give the proper attention to a sub-committee existence for this purpose; and we feel that only by the creation by the House—we would even agree a joint committee would be better—but for our purpose, the House itself, a special committee on the captive nations to put a rifle on this target and expose im-

perialism and colonialism where it really exists—in Soviet Communist Russia.

Dr. JUDD. Thank you, Congressman FLOOD, for speaking on this important proposal during this week which our nation annually observes as Captive Nations Week.

ON THE WARSAW PACT

Sir: The writer of your July 8 editorial, "Disarray in the Warsaw Pact," has a fine command of the adjective and the adverb, but a rather faulty memory of recent history.

The Soviets proposed an "all-Europe security plan" as long ago as Aug. 11, 1955 for the then-stated purpose of liquidating the NATO and Warsaw pacts.

In usual Soviet fashion, propagandists kept this issue alive for several years. On May 27, 1958, Moscow announced the USSR would "pull its troops out of Romania" and reduce troops in Hungary to get NATO powers to join with her in a 25-year non-aggression pact.

When your editorial suggests it would be great if the Kremlin agrees with Mr. Ceausescu of Romania, the impression is given that the new proposal for abolishing NATO and Warsaw pacts is made against the opposition of Moscow. Not at all so.

You may be interested, and your editorial writer may also be intrigued, by a Columbia-Harvard Research Group report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee February 14, 1960. It stated, in part:

"The objective of Soviet policy toward the advanced industrial countries now and in the near future appears to be not a social transformation of these countries, but a modification of their national policies. That is to say—and a number of distinguished American observers have gone astray on this point—it is not a question, in any short-range projection, of trying to communize the countries of Western Europe, but rather of seeking to bring about changes in the policies of their 'bourgeois' governments. In the first instance, this means changes that will have the effect of weakening the Western alliance; later, it may be hoped to encourage these governments to orient their policies more favorably toward the Soviet Union to make their industrial output available to the Soviet economic complex. In the short-term situation, the direction of the flow of industrial output of Western Europe is a major factor in the world power balance."

It would seem that the Soviets have made considerable progress toward implementing this above-stated policy while we have suffered from not having any stateable, long or short term policy of a similar scope toward the Soviet Union or the Communist bloc.

DONALD L. MILLER,

Executive Director, National Captive Nations Committee.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The editorial was not meant to give the impression cited by Mr. Miller. Its main point was that Romania's position in the Warsaw Pact seemed to be having the wholesome effect of blocking the Kremlin's efforts to impose on the alliance a rigid, Soviet-dominated political, economic and military integration fit only for truly captive nations.

LEGISLATION TO HELP WIN THE ECONOMIC BATTLE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, we are at this moment engaged in one of the most difficult and perilous missions a free nation has ever set upon. The conflict in South Vietnam, is costing the American people \$33 million a day in military aid,

and an untold amount of priceless life and property. It is appalling to us all, I am sure, to witness the thousands of persons who are losing their lives and billions of dollars which are being expended in the machinations of war, when these resources could be much better spent in the forward progress of mankind. Yet we stand committed to our belief in the right of self-determination for the brave people of South Vietnam. In the pressures of our military activity, much of the attention of the world and the press has been on our military operations. But I submit to you that we are fighting a three-faced battle: a military war, a political war, and an economic war.

In order to be successful in bringing independence and freedom to South Vietnam, we must win all three battles. The military battle, although long and difficult, will ultimately result in victory. The political battle, tremendously complicated, is slowly being resolved. But the firm basis upon which sovereign and independent nations stand must ultimately be economic. Today I am introducing legislation which is vitally needed to help win the economic battle in South Vietnam.

My bill will provide tremendous incentives for private enterprise in the United States to furnish its know-how and technical ability in the production of industrial-type management and job opportunities in South Vietnam. The great system of American private enterprise has served as an inspiring example for many underdeveloped countries of the world. It must assist the development of a strong, free, and private enterprise system in South Vietnam. I think American business will enthusiastically lend its know-how to help win the economic war in South Vietnam and to provide a locally owned business base for job and management opportunities there. This bill will provide for a guarantee of 100 percent for any American private investor or business concern against inability to convert money into U.S. dollars, expropriation, and loss due to war. In addition, my legislation calls for a 90-percent guarantee against any commercial loss in the investment.

American businessmen have recognized the opportunity in South Vietnam and have made direct private investment to a total of over \$5 million, exclusive of construction. Recent private studies indicate that companies moving into South Vietnam have average profits of 20 to 30 percent on their investments. Last December, a seven-man mission of U.S. businessmen sponsored by the Agency for International Development, reported favorably on the profit prospects for a wide range of small or medium industries and told of a rising number of inquiries. But while the response on the part of the private enterprise system has been sympathetic and encouraging, it has nowhere matched the overwhelming need for this type of economic activity.

My bill would also provide for grants for surveys of investment by private enterprise. The surveys would be financed by the U.S. Government to encourage private investors to look into the vast opportunities open for business and in-

It is always good to hear Dr. Nestor Procyk speak in his own style. There can never be any question of his sincerity and his enthusiasm. He was most gracious in his commendation of Kiwanis and its noble aims and purposes. He then proceeded with the formal introduction of the speaker of the day, the Honorable John R. Pillion. In his introduction he carefully reviewed the spirit of public service that has characterized John Pillion.

In his address, John Pillion paused to pay tribute to Kiwanis and to congratulate International on its objects and objectives. He then proceeded to outline certain international problems that face the free world, and cited great challenges in a situation where some one-third of the world is "captive" and another one-third is "uncommitted." At the conclusion of his address he was greeted by a standing ovation.

It was a salutary meeting with P.P. Don Murphy presiding in his usual inimitable style, bringing greetings from Prez Ralph Garnish who is still apparently "cherchez the femme" that Veep Ab Homburger mentioned at one meeting, with Johnny Metseelaar introducing guests and Lions and Rotarians, and with the team of Riebling and Stradtman performing in great style.

VERNON L. THOMPSON, P.P.

[Program 471, Washington Report, July 18, 1966]

DR. JUDD INTERVIEW WITH DR. LEV DOBRIANSKY, "THE ORIGIN OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK"

ANNOUNCER. This is the American Security Council Washington Report. Speaking from Washington, here is our editor, Dr. Walter H. Judd.

DR. JUDD. Each July, during this week, America re-declares its support for the nations and peoples of the world who have fallen under the yoke of Communist tyranny. On the recommendations of the Congress of these United States, the President proclaims this to be Captive Nations Week. The author of this annual movement to pay tribute to the world's oppressed is my good friend, Dr. Lev Dobriansky, Professor of Economics at Georgetown University here in Washington.

I have asked Dr. Dobriansky to tell us more about the significance of Captive Nations Week.

DR. DOBRIANSKY. The significance of Captive Nations Week has been consistently reflected since 1959, when the resolution was first passed. Last year, for example, the top Russian ideologist, Mikhail Suslov, had this to say concerning Captive Nations Week: "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagoguery of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke."

DR. DOBRIANSKY. The Captive Nations Resolution and the Week concentrate on the close to 1 billion people from the Danube over to the Pacific and, also, in Asia and in Cuba. It is a deep thorn in the side of the Moscow chieftains because it brings up one of the greatest weaknesses and vulnerabilities within the U.S.S.R. itself.

There has never been a monolithic structure within the Soviet Union itself and this resolution concentrates not only on the areas that most Americans are familiar with—the captive areas of Central Europe, Asia and now Cuba, but also those within the U.S.S.R.

During the Captive Nations Week observance of last year, and again this year, we have supported the President's policy concerning Red aggression in Vietnam. We raise the question: What about the 17 million captive people in North Vietnam? When will we allow the South Vietnamese to point their strategy toward the liberation of their brethren in captive North Vietnam? This and numerous other issues will be discussed

in the course of this week. Americans should become more familiar with all of these captive nations and share this observance with us this week.

DR. JUDD. Thank you, Dr. Lev Dobriansky, the man who conceived the idea of Captive Nations Week in which Americans may demonstrate their continued support for those millions of people who yearn for freedom from the cruel tyranny of Communism under which they are still compelled to live.

[Program 472, Washington Report, July 19, 1966]

DR. JUDD INTERVIEW WITH MARIA MIHAJLOV, "PLAN FOR FREE PRESS IN YUGOSLAVIA"

DR. JUDD. My guest today is Miss Maria Mihajlov (MEE-HI-LOV), who is the sister of Mihajlo Mihajlov and a citizen of Yugoslavia. Last year, Mr. Mihajlov demonstrated a rare spirit of independence by writing "Moscow Summer," an essay commenting unfavorably on conditions in Russia. For this he was jailed by the Tito government and then released on a suspended sentence. Today, he is again tempting fate by proposing to publish an independent opposition magazine in Yugoslavia. His sister, Maria, is a student in the United States. While here, she is acting as the voice of Mr. Mihajlov in this country. Her purpose is to make known to the American people the nature of her brother's project and the crucial importance of its outcome.

Miss Mihajlov, would you please tell us about your brother's project?

MISS MIHAJLOV. My brother's project is to publish an independent magazine in opposition to one-party system rule in Yugoslavia. The purpose of this magazine would be, as he puts it, to oppose the one party system as a matter of principle, and to take an anti-Marxist and anti-totalitarian position and to promote Democratic Socialism which is entirely in keeping with the constitution and existing laws.

DR. JUDD. Miss Mihajlov, what do you think this project may accomplish?

MISS MIHAJLOV. The magazine will serve as a nucleus for future non-Communist Socialist legal opposition. This will serve as the first breakthrough which my brother and I hope and believe will stimulate opposition in other iron curtain countries. This is a test of the Yugoslav constitution. If the Yugoslav government denies my brother his legal right, this at least, will reveal to the world that the liberalization is nothing but talk.

DR. JUDD. How do you believe that we in the West can influence the decision of the Yugoslav government?

MISS MIHAJLOV. My brother needs the greatest possible publicity for his project in the free world. It is not money—it is moral support that he needs.

DR. JUDD. Why do you believe such pressure will have any effect on the Yugoslav government?

MISS MIHAJLOV. My brother feels that Tito is increasingly in the need of economic help from the West and simply cannot afford to ignore public opinion of the free world.

DR. JUDD. Miss Mihajlov, what are your own future plans?

MISS MIHAJLOV. Well, when I get my M.A. degree, I will go back to Yugoslavia. I didn't break any laws of my country. I love my people and I want to serve my country.

DR. JUDD. Thank you, Miss Maria Mihajlov.

[Program 474, Washington Report, July 21, 1966]

ANOTHER LOOK BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—DR. JUDD INTERVIEW WITH MISS MONICA FLIDR

DR. JUDD. My guest today—Miss Monica Flidr of Czechoslovakia—has been before our microphone previously to tell of her recent escape from Communist domination of her homeland. Today—in this week of America's

solemn reiteration of our support for the peoples of all nations captive under Communism—I would like to ask you, Miss Flidr, what most irritates the citizens of Communist-run countries?

MISS FLIDR. In my frank opinion, I wouldn't start with academic freedoms. It is irritating, but mostly daily life contains of small and mostly economic things, so I would say that from economic point of view, it would be that, well, unavailability of items of daily use whether it's food or dresses or electric appliances. On the other hand, drop in level of all services, and on the other hand, from psychological point of view, continuing strain of vast propaganda in our newspapers where you can find out that everything works out marvelously and that everybody has reasons only to satisfaction but not to complaints.

And I would like to add here that, especially in families with children, there is great dissatisfaction with school propaganda and indoctrination, because children hear something entirely different in their families and something entirely different in the school and they become hypocrites and it irritates parents and children, both of them.

DR. JUDD. Miss Flidr, in terms of what the United States and the Free World generally might presently do to help, what would be of greatest help to the peoples of Captive Nations?

MISS FLIDR. What I would say that perhaps would be the best thing would be if people in captive nations would see that especially United States are accepting responsibilities and obligations towards the countries fighting against Communism, let's say as in Viet Nam, this would give us hope and this would psychologically help very much in idea of revolt, in my opinion. I know how disappointed we were after Hungary in 1956, and I know how glad people were when United States helped in Viet Nam.

DR. JUDD. Thank you, Miss Monica Flidr.

[Program 473, Washington Report, July 20, 1966]

RELIGION IN THE SATELLITES—DR. JUDD INTERVIEWS WITH DR. CHARLES W. LOWRY, PRESIDENT, FOUNDATION FOR RELIGIOUS ACTION

DR. JUDD. My guest today is Dr. Charles W. Lowry, President of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order and the author of the internationally known book "Communism and Christ." Dr. Lowry is one of the nation's foremost authorities on the relationship between Communism and religion. Dr. Lowry, as we honor and remember the captive nations this week, will you tell us something about the status of religion in the East European captive nations?

DR. LOWRY. Yes, the model or the classical example and the model for emulation, of course, is always the Soviet Union. But the satellites present a variety of circumstances that make for quite a few differences.

For example, Poland, which we are very much aware of at the moment in the news—Poland has 95% Catholics. Now this gives the Catholics a great advantage. Also, there is an identification of the religious and the national that is almost unprecedented anywhere else in the world, I think, in Poland. This is probably the reason for the stepping up of resistance to religion and attempt to check it and to herd it and harass it at the present time, when we are having the 1,000th anniversary of Poland and when religion is very prominent, as it is very prominent in the feelings of the people, and religion has never suffered as much in Poland as in the other satellites in the other Communist countries.

Yugoslavia is very much in the public eye at the present time because of a most important recent happening, namely the forging of a new Concordat between the Catholic

dustry as a way in which the economic war can be assisted.

The country of South Vietnam has great resources, and the Vietnamese are good, hard-working and ambitious people, but they are without the technical ability that is necessary for the creation of a sound economic system. Since we do not wish to assume colonial obligations or powers, my bill provides for the disposition of all projects initiated under this act to the Government of South Vietnam or to private South Vietnamese investors after a 15-year period and at the cost of the value of the investment.

Thus, the private enterprise system of America, which has developed this Nation into the wealthiest country on the face of the earth, will lend a helping hand to a brave people so that they might improve their economy and win the third of the battles which they must overcome to emerge as an independent, free, and sovereign nation. I believe this idea is consistent with aspirations of our President's policies.

NICKEL SHORTAGE—A NATIONAL PROBLEM

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there are certain industries located within the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut, which I represent, that are dependent for their business life upon a plentiful supply of nickel ore. At the present time the worldwide shortage of nickel is threatening the operations and the jobs in these industries. I am certain that such an impact is not limited to my district. In fact, the shortage of nickel may rightfully be considered a national problem.

In an effort to alleviate some of the difficulties caused by the tight supply of nickel, I introduced yesterday legislation (H.R. 17254) authorizing the disposal of surplus nickel from the national stockpile. This bill authorizes the disposal of approximately 24.5 million pounds of nickel from the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act—50 U.S.C. 98-98h. It has been determined by the Office of Emergency Planning that this quantity is not required to meet stockpile needs.

In the last session of Congress Public Law 89-323 was enacted and authorized the release of 200 million pounds of excess nickel from the national stockpile. However, due to the temporary shortage of this vital metal, most of the amount released has been used up. In fact, I am informed by the General Services Administration that there is approximately 1 month's supply left from this authorization or 3 months' supply with selective allocation.

The approximately 24.5 million pounds covered by my bill would provide sufficient material to fill urgent industry requirements. It is hoped that the nickel supply situation will be materially improved by the time this additional Gov-

ernment-owned nickel is absorbed by industry.

The bill I have introduced would waive the procedural requirements of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act with respect to publication and transmittal of notice and the 6-month waiting period. The bill would, however, preserve the substantive requirements of section 3 with respect to protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of procedures, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The enactment of this bill would not require the expenditure of additional Federal funds. Furthermore the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate consideration of this bill in view of the exigencies of the present nickel supply situation.

AFL-CIO ADVISES WAR CRITIC SILENCE

(Mr. POOL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members of Congress to a recent statement by the AFL-CIO as reported by the Washington Post this morning. They advise the American people to unite in support of our Nation's efforts against the Communist enemy we are fighting in Vietnam.

The statement follows:

AFL-CIO ADVISES WAR CRITIC SILENCE

CHICAGO, August 24.—The AFL-CIO in effect today advised critics of American policy in Vietnam to shut up.

While claiming that "the right to dissent is sacred," a resolution approved by the federation's Executive Council at its quarterly meeting here insisted that "disruption by even a well-meaning minority can only pollute and poison the bloodstream of our democracy."

The strongly worded motion singled out the Soviet Union as the foremost villain in the Vietnamese fighting, claimed that the United States "isn't resorting to an escalation of the war," and accused the Communists of "the most savage ruthlessness and reckless bombings against civilians."

"Those who would deny our military forces unstinting support are, in effect, aiding the Communist enemy of our country—at the very moment when it is bearing the heaviest burdens in defense of world peace and freedom," it said.

Some officials of the AFL-CIO, who give qualified support to the Johnson Administration's policies in Southeast Asia, professed acute distress over what they claimed was the jingoistic and hawklike tone of the resolution.

But Walter P. Reuther, a bitter critic of the federation's stand on many international issues, joined in unanimous approval of the resolution after two minor word changes, according to federation sources.

Sources within the federation said Reuther gave grudging support to the Vietnam resolution after these changes were made:

"Russian, Chinese and North Vietnamese warlords" were changed to "Russian, Chinese and North Vietnamese governments." And the word "such" was deleted before the phrase "disruption by a well-meaning minority."

SPECIAL POWERS FOR THE PRESIDENT TO CURB INFLATION

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a bill that I have introduced today to authorize the President to invoke temporary emergency price, wage, and rent ceilings whenever the United States has declared against a foreign nation or whenever the Congress by concurrent resolution shall find and declare that grave national emergencies exist, and that the exercise of such authority is necessary in the interest of national security for economic stability.

Mr. Speaker, the emergency in Vietnam and our increased commitments throughout the world make it essential that the President be possessed of power that was formerly his during World War II and the Korean conflict, when on the advice of his economic advisers, he as Chief Executive of the land determines that runaway inflation is a national problem.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is essential that attention be drawn to the fact that today the President is without immediate remedy to control inflationary price and wage increases. During periods of great national tension resulting from the spiralling cost of living, great responsibility for the continuance of a healthy American economy falls upon the shoulders of the President. As the Nation has noted, our President has not shirked these responsibilities, but has repeatedly appealed for restraints and the initiation of many voluntary efforts to curb rising costs.

Mr. Speaker, I note with some degree of satisfaction the fact that the President has requested of the Congress legislative action to control rising interest rates. While I deem such action on the part of the President as very meritorious and helpful, I cannot help but to feel that the request should have been enlarged so as to include the granting of power to the executive department to deal with the matter of cost relating to prices and wages as well.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that while I applaud President Johnson's efforts to secure a voluntary compliance at 3.2, I do not share his optimism insofar as the long-range merit of the voluntary guideline program, and I believe that it is high time that the Congress of the United States, the elected Representatives of the people of the Nation, share with the President of the United States some united responsibility for what the President is attempting to do under the bill that I have introduced today.

The President could continue his very consistent program of seeking the cooperation of men of business and labor to combat the spiraling cost of living, but armed by this legislation, his effort to secure compliance would be strengthened by the realization on the part of business and labor alike, that the Congress has empowered him to invoke controls almost immediately if he felt that

profit margins and price increases on basic commodities and wage rates, as well as interest rates, were getting out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the American public throughout the land is confronted with the same basic problem—for some wage rates through collective bargaining, and an increasing part of the benefit of these enlarged wage rates is reduced by the diminishing purchasing power of the dollar.

The situation is somewhat compounded by the shortage of labor and some basic materials, and prices seem to be all on the upward track. Distressed heads of families whose budgets are in a squeeze find it difficult to meet the cost of basic essentials such as food, clothing, auto insurance, education, and the like. One commodity hike tends to push up the prices of other much-needed commodities. Mr. John Q. Public is beginning to register alarm and to record by letter to every congressional office on the Hill his view that labor, business, and Government have all defaulted in their so-called voluntary effort to hold the price line.

Mr. Speaker, John Q. Public has come to the clear and logical conclusion that in present-day America individual self-interest has taken precedence over national need. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but to feel that world prestige of the American dollar is on the decline and that the dollar can hardly be expected to hold its exchange value due to inflationary trends here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are living in a time of grave national emergency insofar as our fiscal planning is concerned.

If this 2d session of the 89th Congress adjourns without putting into effect strong wage and price controls, this Republic within the 10-year period ahead may well find herself in the same position as Great Britain today, where the economy is so seriously imperiled by the devaluation of the pound sterling.

During this period of grave fiscal responsibility, I call upon the Congress to immediately initiate hearings to authorize these temporary, emergency price, wage, and rent ceilings, and to empower the Executive to secure compliances with respect to fiscal programing that heretofore have not been achieved through voluntary effort.

RELIEF FOR DEPENDENTS OF PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, I addressed the House in protest over the way our prisoners of war in Vietnam are being treated. I pointed out at that time the necessity of action by the House to officially protest this mistreatment by the Communist North Vietnamese.

It has now come to light, Mr. Speaker, that the wives and children of these very same prisoners are also being subjected to neglect, cruelties and redtape here at home while their husbands sit

out lonely hours of filth and torture in Communist prison camps.

I served some time in a prisoner of war camp in World War II, Mr. Speaker, and in freedom or in a prison compound, Mr. Speaker, I know the lifesaving thought that keeps a soldier from giving up is that at least his loved ones at home are being looked after by a grateful Government.

I am sorely distressed, Mr. Speaker, and I am certain the Congress and the American people will be equally distressed, to learn that such is not the case with dependent wives, mothers, and children of our fighting men in Vietnam who are now captives of the Communists.

Some of them cannot get income tax refunds because they are required to secure their soldier-husband's signature on a joint return—obviously an impossibility.

Others cannot secure license plates for automobiles they need to transport their children off the military installations they are forced to leave when their husbands and the fathers of their children are ordered overseas.

They cannot even get adequate medical care.

They cannot get commissary and post exchange food.

They cannot get access to joint family savings accounts.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are treating the dependents of our prisoners of war almost as badly as the Communists are treating the prisoners of war themselves.

This is a disgrace, Mr. Speaker.

These dependents are being described as the dependents of "nonpersons" legally. They are not "nonpersons," Mr. Speaker. They are our people—Americans—temporarily husbandless and fatherless Americans, because we have sent their breadwinners off to war.

We worry about the American image abroad, Mr. Speaker. Endless miles of films and pictures of American street rioting appears on foreign television and in the foreign press.

I would call your attention to what the American image is—not abroad, Mr. Speaker—but here at home in the eyes of the wives and children of captured soldiers when they are told to get lost by Government and military agencies.

This is the image we need concern ourselves with, Mr. Speaker.

The image of neglect at home, in soldier, sailor, marine, and Navy homes—if the pittance they are left to live on provides for a house.

Our duty is plain, understandable, clear, and necessary, Mr. Speaker.

These people do not have enough money; they are driven from military housing, if they ever had it, while the Secretary of Defense tries to give away land within the shadow of the Capitol at Bolling—land that is ideal for building the homes these service families must have.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to contact the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to promptly refund income tax overpayments due to these dependents, and to waive any requirement of signatures of their husbands in all cases. Second. I shall ask him to defer col-

lection of all income taxes from all dependents of our prisoners of war during the period when their husbands and fathers are in captivity.

If the Revenue Commissioner refuses to take these steps, or if he needs legislative authority to accomplish them, I intend to introduce such legislation and confer with my colleagues on Ways and Means to insure its speedy consideration and enactment.

I intend to seek the advice and cooperation of my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. I intend to ask that a directive be sent to the Secretary of Defense, telling him to instruct all branches of the military service to set aside a special fund immediately, out of which dependents of prisoners can seek immediate financial help.

I will ask the same of those chairmen of committees and subcommittees dealing with civilian agencies with prisoner of war personnel in Vietnam.

Perhaps it may be necessary, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress itself to set up a special committee with special appropriations to ride herd on this unseemly mess. At least every dependent of every serviceman in captivity should be living at the level of prosperity set by the administration poverty officials—since these are the families of our fighting men we are talking about—not defendants of street rioters.

This is an incredible, adominable situation, Mr. Speaker.

And our neglect of the prisoner dependents is symptomatic of how little too many Americans care about those who are doing our fighting in Vietnam. And the same applies to those they leave behind to eke out a living, not as wards of the military, not as wards of all of us as they should be, but as castoffs to be forgotten while we pump billions into caring for everybody else everywhere else in the world.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is a shame, that this Congress would ever need to have this called to its attention. I do not know who is to blame, and I do not think we need take the time to fix it. Our course is clear. If necessary, Mr. Speaker, we will carry to the front door of every home, tent, or trailer, where these neglected dependents are living, not only a bag of groceries if that is needed, but the proof as well that at least the Congress of the United States has their concern at heart.

Are there not a few crumbs available for the dependents of the soldiers we send to Vietnam out of the \$58 billion handed to the Defense Department, Mr. Speaker?

We had better find out.

Is the Secretary of Defense so concerned about poverty among civilians he cannot see it in his own ranks?

We had better find out.

We hold the purse strings, Mr. Speaker. I suggest we loosen them enough to take care of dependents of prisoners of war.

Let us be generous and at least secure for them a poverty-level income.

Let us do this even though these men are not picketing and rioting in protest

of the war in Vietnam, but fighting it—or were doing so until captured.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, instead of refinancing the United Nations, as we are being asked to do, we can refinance the families of our prisoners of war in Communist POW camps.

I suggest we owe it to them, and to their families.

JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION TO PROVIDE 12-YEAR TERMS FOR THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution which would provide 12-year terms for the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. It reads as follows:

The Judges of the Supreme Court shall hold their offices for terms of 12 years, running from the date of their commissions. They shall be eligible to be again appointed.

The provisions of this article shall not limit the tenure in office during good behavior of those Judges of the Supreme Court who hold commissions of appointment at the time this article becomes operative.

In recent years the Court has penetrated so far into the political thicket that it has become snarled therein. The political, economic, and social benefits of the Judges of the Supreme Court become the law of the land.

Under the present system of tenure, during good behavior the Justices are not at any time answerable to anyone, but they exercise a power unreachable.

My proposal is offered as a mechanism to bring the Supreme Court within our system of checks and balances.

After a Supreme Court Justice has served 12 years his term would expire. Whoever is President at that time might not choose to nominate him for another term; or the Senate may not choose to advise and consent to the nomination if made. The President and Senate in this way would pass upon the qualifications and performance of members of the Supreme Court periodically.

WHY, IN THE NAME OF GOD?

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, the Aurora Advertiser of Aurora, Mo., carried an editorial entitled "Why, in the Name of God?"

This editorial by the editor, Mr. Robert Lowry, is a commentary on the irresponsible and often treasonous action by the so-called New Left, as it relates to America's struggle and sacrifices in order to defend the free world.

A number of people in Lawrence County, Mo., have sent me copies of the editorial. I am inclined to agree with them that it represents one of the most perceptive, hard-hitting commentaries on the paradox in which our Nation finds itself today.

On one hand, men are fighting and dying in the struggle 10,000 miles away from home, and on the other hand, Communist sympathizers are given a free hand to commit almost any kind of act designed to prolong that struggle and inhibit our ability to support our soldiers.

The editorial follows and I hope it will receive the wide spread recognition which I am confident it deserves:

WHY, IN THE NAME OF GOD?

For 21 years we have sent our young men overseas in Europe by the thousands—so many there's scarcely a home in the land which hasn't had a member there in the army of occupation for one reason—to keep communism from taking over the free world.

For 21 years we've sent our fine young men to Africa, the Near East, the Far East, the islands of the Pacific, up into the arctic cold and down into tropical heat, kept them there month after weary month, year after weary year, for just one reason—to keep communism from taking over the free world.

For 21 long years this nation has spent billions upon billions to finance the Marshall Plan, subsidize the UN and NATO, help the neutrals, help even communist countries and those who twist our tail and spit in our face every chance they get until we have so squandered our reserves that should all the countries to whom we now owe gold call for repayment at once we could give them every ounce and still not be square with the world, for just one reason—to prevent the spread of communism and the enslavement of free men.

For 21 long years this nation, after winning a great war, has strained its economic resources, marshalled its engineers and scientists, used up raw materials and manpower much better used for other purposes to create, maintain and enlarge an arsenal not only for our own armed forces but for a long list of other nations for one reason, and one reason only, to deter communist aggression and world domination.

Twice in the past two decades, we have drafted our young men and reservists to fight and die—and thousands upon thousands have given their lives in Korea and Viet Nam—for just one reason—to resist communist aggression.

This has been our national purpose for 21 years. This has been our contribution to the life and death struggle to preserve human freedom and prevent the enslavement of that portion of the world population which has not already been enslaved.

No nation has ever been so generous, so unselfish, so dedicated, so self-sacrificing for so long in all the history of mankind. Ours has been a noble purpose, one for which our young men have been willing to give their time, and their lives, and for which Americans have been willing to spend their treasure.

Then why, in the name of God, do we permit the enemy we resist without the borders of this country to work within it unrestrained—protected by every legal gnat so-called liberal interpreters of the law can gag on?

We have seen, this week, a federal judge, fortunately overruled almost without a hearing by a higher court, dare to enjoin a congressional committee seeking to investigate treason in this country—trying to determine

what aid and comfort, material and spiritual, Americans are giving our enemies.

We have heard Americans take the stand, admit they are communists, boast how much they have aided, are aiding, and will aid the very communist soldiers who are killing men wearing the uniform of this country and sent into battle by our own government. We have listened to them defy their country and the congress, disrupt a congressional hearing, call the president of this country a murderer—and let a few off with nothing more than a \$10 fine, while others weren't punished at all!

We have seen treasonable Americans seek by force to prevent the loading of supplies being shipped to soldiers fighting for this country half a globe away and not even be arrested! In fact, simple minded commentators and reporters have dared to criticize an American marine who pushed a crazed young female traitor out of the way of such a shipment because she stumbled and fell into a ditch full of water, which they intimidated was an act of brutality.

We have seen others try to break up college draft examinations, interfere with the work of draft boards, disturb the wedding of our president's daughter, demean and call men moving toward Viet Nam murderers of women and children.

And, if we've done anything, it has been nothing more than to slap them on the wrist and let them know we think they are naughty children!

Why, in the name that is right, do we suffer this? Why do we let people too young to vote or be elected to congress influence our foreign policy? Why do we listen to people so wet behind the ears they'd never be hired for a position of any importance by a private business firm? Why do we spend so much time, blood, treasure and effort opposing communism abroad and let young punks and perverts boast they are communists fighting our government here at home?

Why do we protect with all the force of law the right of admitted communists to teach in publicly supported colleges and universities?

Why do we listen to prattle about the right of dissent by hopheads from hashish or LSD parties on our campuses when other young men have been drafted to give up jobs, leave their families, and die in foreign jungles all in the name of resistance to communism?

Why can't a nation which only 25 years ago could move whole populations of Japanese whose only crime was being the same blood as that of one of our enemies crack down upon these traitors in our midst today?

Why can't we shut these people up for as long as our men are dying for us? If communism be wrong, and if its spread should be prevented, why must we give these agitators freedom to spread it here in America—nay, even protect them as they spread it?

Why, when there is open treason in our streets, on our campuses, even in our congressional hearings, can anyone think that to let it continue unpunished is not to break faith with our men fighting overseas?

If communism must be resisted at all costs in Berlin and Saigon, why shouldn't we resist it with all our might and main in Washington, and Berkeley, and Chicago?

Yes, why?

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY AND THE PRESIDENT'S CLUB

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

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was greatly disturbed to read in a

syndicated column in the Washington Post that a prominent southern California member of the John Birch Society was also a member of the President's Club.

Blame for this deplorable development must rest with the Democratic National Committee for as the major political and intelligence arm of the party it has permitted dollars to replace discretion as its major concern.

This latest incident is but another illustration that the National Committee has failed to keep its house in order for many months.

Many Members have long complained of fouled-up mailing lists.

Party leaders in the States have complained of the committee's casual indifference to their particular political problems.

We have become accustomed to hearing reports that the committee's services are being withheld from Members who dare deviate on certain issues from the position taken by the administration.

Only a few days ago my office called the committee to inquire about a packet of position papers prepared by Republican national headquarters. Although the press several days earlier had given prominent play to the existence of these papers, personnel in the committee's research, library, and public affairs sections were completely unaware of them.

In view of this abysmal record I was not surprised, although greatly disturbed, to read that the John Birch Society has infiltrated the prestigious President's Club.

The club has recently come under heavy fire from the opposition party. Their attack has been grossly unfair, in my judgment, for the focus has been on alleged "influence peddling" rather than on lack of discretion. This latest development makes it patently obvious that the national committee is making no attempt to correlate fat Government contracts with fat contributions.

All the DNC is concerned with is seeing that the checks they receive are properly signed and do not bounce.

Those who purchase membership in the President's Club with the notion that their share of Government business will increase are in for a sad awakening.

They are giving undeserved credence to the GOP's propaganda campaign and undeserved credit to the national committee's ability—even if it were willing—to tie contributions to contracts.

Mr. Speaker, examine for a moment the background of Birch Member J. Edward Martin, of Los Angeles. For several years he has been a chapter leader in a JBS cell. The society's own publicity proclaims that he was host and major sponsor of at least three testimonial dinners for Birch founder and dictator Robert Welch.

J. Edward Martin was appointed to the Republican State Central Committee of California 2 years ago and is an elected member of the GOP's Los Angeles County Central Committee.

Less than a month ago he held a fund-raising party for a Republican candidate for the State senate.

And less than 5 months ago he and his brother and their wives spent \$12,000 for membership in the President's Club.

Although the Democratic National Committee may have laughed all the way to the bank at the time, I am sure it now realizes that all it got for its money was a king-sized headache.

There is only one type of aspirin that can cure the pain—returning the \$12,000 to the Martins with a "thanks but no thanks" note attached.

I would rather see the national committee clad in rags as it walks to the bank to deposit sincerely donated nickels and dimes than see it decked out in a tux and lugging baskets of greenbacks which come from insincere and extremist resources—both left and right.

Mr. Speaker, as proud members of the President's party we cannot permit a lazy, greedy, and irresponsible national committee to tarnish our reputations or, more importantly, the Chief Executive's. He carries the weight of the world on his shoulders and the hopes of millions of Americans and freedom-loving peoples in his heart. We cannot, we dare not, allow the national committee by its incredible indiscretion to add to the President's awesome burden.

The Democratic National Committee can begin to lighten his load this very day by returning the \$12,000 to the Martins.

The altar of greed has no place in the temple of our party.

Let us begin to dismantle it now.

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HORTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the August 23, 1966, meeting of the House Republican Policy Committee a policy statement regarding the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966 was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the complete text of this statement:

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966

From the Morrill Act of 1862 and the creation of the U.S. Office of Education in 1869, to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the Manpower Training Act of 1962, the Republican Party has advocated and supported the important role of education in advancing the capabilities and opportunities of the citizens of the United States. We have recognized that it is only through State

and local cooperation that the greatest educational development can be achieved with federal help.

Under the principle of State and local responsibility, the American educational system has grown so that it compares favorably with that of any other country of the world. In 1960, school enrollments constituted 23.2 percent of total population in the United States, compared to 11.1 percent in Europe and 14.24 percent in the Soviet Union. In this country, total revenues for public schools have grown by 376 percent since 1950 and classroom construction has proceeded at a rate that will provide 653,000 classrooms in the decade 1962 to 1972.

At the time the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was being considered, we were concerned that this poorly-drafted legislation would too often impede rather than help the education effort in this country. We were concerned that it would deprive the State agencies and local school authorities of any real power to shape educational programs to meet local needs. Centralization of power was a theme that ran throughout the entire bill. Now, one year and a number of serious defects later, this Congress is being asked to broaden and expand the original Act. In an almost casual manner, authorizations in excess of \$4.6 billion have been requested. Unfortunately, there has been no meaningful attempt to sort out the vast and confusing tangle of federal programs. Moreover, obvious defects have been either glossed over or totally ignored by the Democratic majority on the committee.

For example, under the present Act, the distribution of funds within a State is established by a set formula. As a result, State education agencies have been unable to channel money to the areas of greatest need. In the past, distribution on the basis of need has been the traditional administrative device for the allocation of federal funds. Such distribution permits State-wide concentration upon the most urgent educational problems. It encourages responsible State educational planning. Unfortunately, the Democratic majority rejected all Republican amendments that would authorize State education agencies to distribute funds in this manner. We believe that an amendment that would give greater flexibility to the States should be adopted.

A Republican amendment that would provide added funds for the low-expenditure States was adopted. This will cure some of the disparity in federal aid between States. However, it does not change the present unsatisfactory method of distribution within States which scatters funds indiscriminately among wealthy and needy school districts.

It is generally agreed that the best hope for reducing educational failure among economically and socially disadvantaged children lies in the area of preschool education. However, during the first year of this Act, only 5.7 percent of the funds under title I have been used for preschool education. Moreover, many of the preschool projects have been enmeshed in the bureaucratic confusion that exists between the U.S. Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity (which is responsible for funding Operation Headstart). Certainly, this program should be unshackled and properly financed so that greater emphasis can be placed on disadvantaged preschool children.

The greatest threat to the independence of State and local educational administration is contained in title III of this Act. This title has placed in the hands of the U.S. Commissioner the sole power to determine which applicant school districts are to receive funds and which educational purposes are to be favored in their use. This has caused frustration and confusion and delayed many worthwhile projects. School administrators from all over the country have vigorously