

substitute. A two-thirds vote is required for final passage.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 144), as amended, pass?

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOSS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If the Senator from New Hampshire were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If the Senator from Maryland were present and voting, he would vote "nay."

If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. BREWSTER (when his name was called). I wish to confirm the live pair which was announced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORRON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORRON] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Russell, S.C.
Bennett	Hill	Russell, Ga.
Boggs	Holland	Saltstall
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Simpson
Carlson	Lausche	Smathers
Church	Long, La.	Smith
Cooper	McClellan	Sparkman
Cotton	Miller	Stennis
Curtis	Montoya	Symington
Dirksen	Mundt	Talmadge
Dominick	Murphy	Thurmond
Eastland	Pastore	Tower
Ellender	Pearson	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Prouty	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Randolph	
Griffin	Robertson	

NAYS—37

Bartlett	Inouye	Morse
Bayh	Jackson	Muskie
Bible	Javits	Nelson
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Neuberger
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Case	Kuchel	Proxmire
Clark	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Douglas	Mansfield	Tydings
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McGee	Yarborough
Gruening	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Harris	Mondale	
Hart	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—14

Allott	Gore	McIntyre
Anderson	Hartke	Metcalf
Bass	Hayden	Morton
Brewster	Jordan, Idaho	Moss
Dodd	Magnuson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49 and the nays are 37. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution, as amended, is rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I say that the crusade for the school prayer amendment was carried on in the best of spirit. It will continue. It will be far better organized throughout the country next time we wrestle with the question of voluntary prayer in our public schools.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend those Senators who engaged in the discussion of the minority leader's proposal concerning prayer in the public schools. Certainly the distinguished minority leader himself carried forward the argument for his measure with all of his abundant skill and grace.

His views, strong and most sincere, were expressed with typical eloquence, with characteristic clarity and, most assuredly, with deep and abiding conviction. In short, the manner in which this delicate issue was handled speaks highly for the junior Illinois Senator, not only for his ability as an outstanding leader, but, more importantly, for his undeniable position as an outstanding American.

The junior Senator from Indiana likewise is to be singled out for the exemplary manner in which his views on school prayer were brought to the attention of the Senate. From the discussion it was obvious that his concern on this issue equals that of the minority leader. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, he clearly excelled both for the thorough manner in which he conducted the hearings and for his full and articulate explanations on the floor of the Senate.

Particularly noteworthy during this discussion were the contributions of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who we all acknowledge as one of the Senate's and, indeed, the Nation's outstanding constitutional historians. Senator ERVIN presented his views with typical clarity and eloquence, with forthright conviction and with compelling persuasiveness. Certainly, we are indebted to him for the light he brought to this issue.

Finally, to the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], Massachusetts [Mr. SALTSTALL], and Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS],

we are grateful, as always, for offering their clear and convincing views. So too the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and Michigan [Mr. HART], are to be thanked for similarly joining along with others to make the discussion lively, enlightening, and certainly one of the most provocative this session.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to query the distinguished majority leader about the program for the rest of the day and the rest of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, responding to the request of the distinguished minority leader, it is anticipated—and this meets with his approval—to take up the UNICEF resolution next.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a point of order. We cannot hear or see the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point is well taken. Senators will take their seats. Attachés will remove themselves from the Chamber or find seats. The galleries will be in order.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the UNICEF resolution will be the next order of business. Then the District of Columbia colleges bill, to which the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] will have an amendment and on which he may want a rollcall.

It is anticipated that on Thursday, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, will report the Labor-HEW appropriation bill. We would like to bring that bill up Friday, but I rather doubt it, because if any Senator objects because of the ? day rule, it will not be called up. If not, that will then become the pending business.

Following that we hope to take up the Department of Transportation bill next week, if it is reported this week; then the comprehensive transportation bill and then the higher education bill.

That is about the best I can say at this time.

"CAN WE CONTROL THE WAR IN VIETNAM?"—ARTICLE BY DR. HENRY STEELE COMMAGER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the September 17 issue of the Saturday Review contains an excellent article by Dr. Henry Steele Commager entitled, "Can We Control the War in Vietnam?" I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

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

CAN WE CONTROL THE WAR IN VIETNAM? WHAT HISTORY TELLS US ABOUT LIMITED CONFLICTS

(By Henry Steele Commager)

It is in Vietnam that we are fighting, but the ultimate enemy—so we are assured with anxious eloquence—is China. The "aggression" we are called upon to stop is "Communist aggression," and the Communism we are asked to contain is Chinese Communism.

September 21, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22619

ranking representatives of all faiths have opposed it, and Catholic opposition or indifference to the question of the amendment has grown over the years.

At first glance, this indifference tends to surprise, if not shock. The simple question arises: "Are not the clergy in favor of prayer?" The answer here of course is Yes. But the more accurate question is: "Are the clergy in favor of prayers in the public school?" which is something different. And the real question is this: "Are the clergy in favor of amending the Constitution to permit these prayers?"

It is with respect to this last question the clergy have been silent or opposed, and their reason for so doing is substantial. (It is not, as the National Review writer held, to protect federal aid to Catholic schools.)

First, to consider the matter logically one may ask if there is a proper proportion between means and end. To amend the Constitution is a very weighty matter and should not be undertaken lightly. And if prayers are a weighty matter, it can be questioned whether the brief, synthetic, and watered-down prayer that is usually composed in order to please all students and their parents is worth an amendment to the Constitution. Second, one can also ask whether in our pluralistic society such a prayer is worth the discontent, even ill-will, in the community that these prayers often incite. Prayers are intended to lead us to God, not to fight with our neighbors.

The most weighty reason we know that can be given against the Dirksen amendment is that it is not necessary. This newspaper has in the past—and we believe Senator Pell also—proposed that in our public schools a moment of silence be permitted each morning for children to pray, or not, as they wished. For this no Constitutional amendment is needed. Furthermore, a moment of silence permits those who pray a better method of praying and those who will not pray in public the freedom of desisting without the embarrassment they insist they suffer.

A moment of silent communion with God is certainly far superior to the types of prayer that have been served up in communities where school prayers have been permitted.

We urge once more that school systems and teachers in the State employ the simple method of permitting a moment of silence each day for their students to pray. In this way no one can be offended; we believe that God will be pleased; and our Constitution will remain as it is.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote for Senate Joint Resolution 148 which is before us today. This resolution was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator DIRKSEN, on March 22, and I joined as cosponsor along with 47 other Members of the Senate.

My statement shall be brief because I believe the purpose of the amendment is understood by all Members. Nevertheless, since this proposal holds wide interest throughout the country, I wish to state my views.

The proposed amendment is designed to resolve the uncertainty created by recent decisions of the Supreme Court and of our lower courts. In *Engel against Vitale*, the Supreme Court held that a prayer formulated by the New York State Board of Regents and recommended by them for use in the schools of that State constituted the "establishment of religion" and was forbidden by the first amendment of the Constitution. In the

case of *School District of Abington against Schempp* a majority of the Supreme Court invalidated a Pennsylvania statute which required that "at least 10 verses from the Holy Bible shall be read, without comment, at the opening of each public school on each schoolday. Any child shall be excused from such Bible reading, or attending such Bible reading, upon the written request of his parent or guardian. The Court found that the statute violated the establishment clause of the first amendment.

Without attempting to analyze fully the holdings of the Court, I simply point out that these decisions were based on the proposition that a particular form of prayer cannot be required or prescribed by the Government, whether it be the United States, the States, or instrumentalities of the States such as municipalities and school boards. To do so would be to violate the first amendment of the Constitution which declares that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And, in 1940, the Supreme Court in the case of *Cantwell against Connecticut* held that the 14th amendment made the 1st amendment applicable to the States and local governing bodies.

The proposed constitutional amendment before us today—known as the Dirksen amendment—reads as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:*

## "ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall prohibit the authority administering any school, school system, educational institution or other public building supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds from providing for or permitting the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer. Nothing contained in this article shall authorize any such authority to prescribe the form or content of any prayer.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

It can be seen from reading the proposed amendment that it leaves undisturbed the decisions of the Supreme Court which forbid the States to prescribe the form of content of prayers or to require the recitation of prayers in public schools. The Dirksen amendment would overrule the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in *Stein against Oshinsky*, in which the Court sustained the right of a State school district to refuse to allow voluntary prayers in the classroom. In this connection, I think an analogy may be made to those cases involving the saluting of the flag. In the case of *West Virginia Board of Education against Barnette*, the Supreme Court held that no student can be compelled to participate in the saluting of the

flag when such participation is contrary to his religious beliefs or conscience. But the Court never went so far as to hold that no school district can deny the saluting of the flag for those who wish to participate simply because there is a student who does not wish to salute the flag because of his religious beliefs. The fact that one or more students do not desire to engage in voluntary prayer should not prevent other students from doing so.

Our country has observed the tradition of tolerance for minorities as well as majorities. Dean Erwin Griswold of the Harvard Law School has analyzed this tradition with great insight in an article in which he stated:

In a country which has a great tradition of tolerance, is it not important that minorities, who have benefited so greatly from that tolerance, should be tolerant, too, as long as they are not compelled to take affirmative action themselves, and nothing is done which they cannot wait out, or pass respectfully by, without their own personal participation, if they do not want to give it? Is it not a travesty that we have brought ourselves, through an essentially thought-denying absolutist approach, to the point where such things as chaplains in our prisons, or chapels in our military academies, can be seriously and solemnly raised as threats to the religious freedom which is guaranteed by the First Amendment—as made applicable to the States, in very general terms, by the Fourteenth Amendment? In saying this, I am fully mindful of the rights of those who have or profess no religion, and who are surely entitled to the same respect as any one else—and should themselves give the same respectful regard to the rights of other citizens, accepting reasonable arrangements made in this area by the majority, with no compulsion on them to participate.

Finally, our system of government which emphasizes the freedom of the individual, is connected with religious faith. It would be a sad day in the history of our country if it should cease to be so. While the first amendment to the Constitution prohibits—and properly so—our Government from establishing a religion or supporting it, or prescribing its exercise in our public schools, I think it wrong that we should deny individual children the right of exercising freedom of religious thought such that they may pause at some time during the schoolday to utter a voluntary prayer, to express their belief and faith.

For these reasons, I will support and vote for this amendment, which would permit voluntary prayers in our public schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of Senate Joint Resolution 144, as amended.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do I correctly understand that this is a constitutional vote which will require a two-thirds vote for passage, and that the Dirksen resolution substitutes for it, on final passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is on the final passage of the joint resolution as amended by the Dirksen

That China is Communist is not denied, and that it is militaristic and aggressive is taken for granted, for after all is this not the very nature of Communism? With every year China grows more powerful and more intractable. Already it has a population of 700 million; already it is well on the way to industrialization; already it has the atomic bomb. Clearly—so the argument runs—it is China that inspires and sustains the war in Vietnam, supplying, if not the men, all other necessities of war. If our intervention should fail of its objectives—whatever they are—it is not Vietnam that will win, but China. And if China is victorious in Vietnam what is to prevent it from moving on to Laos and Cambodia, Thailand and Burma, then to the Philippines and Indonesia, and ultimately—the imagination boggles—into Japan, Australia, and India?

Meantime, we carry the war ever close to China. Now we bomb within a few miles of the Chinese border; now we engage in "hot pursuit" over Chinese territory; now we grimly warn that there is no sanctuary for enemy planes on Chinese soil. And China, in turn, feels itself surrounded and beleaguered: a hostile Soviet Russia pressing on the long boundary to the North and controlling territory historically Chinese; American bases in Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, and Taiwan; the Seventh Fleet—most powerful on the globe—ruling the South China Sea; giant bombers based on Guam; almost 300,000 soldiers in Vietnam, with more on the way.

We are alarmed—and so are the Chinese—and when two powerful and proud antagonists are alarmed, almost anything can happen. Senator FULBRIGHT and many of his Senatorial colleagues think we are on a "collision course" with China, a view which the Chinese themselves share. Meantime, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara assure us that our own government has no intention of broadening the war. And the military, in turn, however much some of its members might yearn for a showdown now rather than later, discount the notion that China is able to engage in a major war.

There is, alas, neither comfort nor reassurance in all this. Wars rarely come because they are carefully planned and deliberately launched—not ours anyway—but because circumstances get out of control. They come, most of them, notwithstanding earnest and even sincere efforts to avoid them. To assume that statesmen, or military men, sitting in distant capitals, can manipulate the great, seething, and tumultuous processes of history as they might manipulate pieces on a chessboard is to ignore the lessons of the past. The lessons of the past are not those implicit in the arguments of a Kahn or a Kissinger; they are rather those explicit in the lines of Euripides:

"And the ends men look for cometh not,  
And a path there is where no man thought,  
So hath it fallen here."

History, to be sure, tells us of wars that were quite deliberately planned. Napoleon knew just what he was doing when he renewed his war on Britain in 1803; so did Bismarck in his wars on Denmark, Austria, and France. Hitler planned his attack on Poland, Norway, the Low Countries, and Russia, and Japan carefully calculated its attack on Pearl Harbor. Such things, it will be said, belong to the bad Old World; they do not happen in the New. Indeed they do not. We do not plan our wars; we blunder into them. Doubtless this has its advantages: We can maintain to the end that we are a "peace-loving" people, even as we are locked in mortal combat with our enemies—who, of course, are not "peace-loving."

That is, in any event, the record of most of our wars. Let us see what light that record throws on the problem that confronts us now.

Begin with the first of our wars, the War for Independence. It is pretty clear that neither the Americans nor the British wanted war in 1775; it is equally clear that neither people followed policies designed to avoid it. Certainly Colonel Smith, who marched so bravely out on the Concord road to capture the gunpowder stored in that town, did not realize that he was inaugurating a great war, nor did the embattled farmers who fired the shot which Emerson later asserted was heard 'round the world. Neither George III nor Washington wanted war, and though Lexington and Concord were fought in April 1775, the Continental Congress was still debating war and independence a year later. And as late as 1776 Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and other American leaders are on record as deprecating both independence and war. But war came.

Certainly few wanted and fewer expected war in 1812. That war is, indeed, a classic example of the role of chance and of blundering. The British were too absorbed in their war on Napoleon to give any serious thought to American grievances; certainly they had no desire to take on another enemy. Americans protested against illegal impressment and Indian depredations, but had little stomach for a fight. New England did not want war, and sabotaged it when it came; the belligerence of the West has been exaggerated, and it was in any event a belligerence against Indians. When, in 1812, war finally came, it was unnecessary, for the British had already repealed the odious Orders in Council, the ostensible provocation for war. Nevertheless the war came.

As for the next major war, that with Mexico, it is fair to say that it was ardently desired by some, bitterly opposed by others. Santa Anna probably did not want war, but he wanted to indulge in gestures that might provoke war. Polk did, no doubt, want war, and so, too, did a good many Texans, and, supporting them, a good many land-hungry Middle Westerners. The South was not enthusiastic; New England abolitionists charged that the war was fought merely to get "bigger pens to cram slaves in." Certainly there was no need for war; had reason and not passion been in control, the disputes that agitated Mexico, Texas, and the United States could have been negotiated. The Mexican War is a classic example of the way in which a determined President can maneuver the country into a war neither popular nor necessary.

The Civil War, greatest of our wars, was by no means that "irresistible conflict" which Seward predicted. Neither North nor South really wanted war; Southerners hoped to the end that the North would allow them to go in peace; Northerners hoped, to the end, that the "erring sisters" would in fact return to the fold. So said Oliver Wendell Holmes: in an appeal to "Caroline, Child of the Sun":

"Go, then, our rash sister, afar and aloof,  
Run wild in the sunshine away from our roof;  
But when your heart aches and your feet  
have grown sore,  
Remember the pathway that leads to our door."

Lincoln put it more sadly in his second Inaugural Address: "Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive, and the other would accept war rather than let it perish, and the war came. . . . Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. . . . Each looked for an easier triumph and a result less fundamental and astounding."

When secession came, Lincoln allowed Sumter to fall rather than fire the first shot, and Seward contrived a fantastic plan to reunite the nation by warring on Britain and France. All in vain. Events ruled and overruled the plans of men.

The war with Spain was, if not planned, widely desired and widely popular, for American distrust of Spain was deep-rooted, and American sympathy with the heroic Cubans struggling for independence was ardent. President McKinley, to be sure, tried somewhat ineffectually to avoid war over Cuba, but lacked the backbone to put up any real resistance to the war-mongers. War might have been avoided—Spain was prepared to make almost any concessions—had it not been for the bad luck of the explosion of the battleship *Maine* in Havana harbor. There was no evidence at the time that the Spaniards had blown up the *Maine*, and there has been no evidence since, but the country was not interested in evidence. Spain was held responsible for the foul act, and "Remember the *Maine*" echoed across prairie and plain. That fortuitous event was the fuse which set off the war, just as the ineffectual firing on a U.S. destroyer in the Gulf of Tonkin was the fuse that set off the war on North Vietnam. In both cases an administration pledged to peace eagerly seized on a pretext to wage war.

It was, said Theodore Roosevelt, "a splendid little war." The war that grew out of it was not at all splendid, and took everyone by surprise. Indeed so surprising was it that—like the present enterprise in Vietnam—it was not really a war at all. The Americans had liberated the Philippines from Spanish rule, and the Filipinos, or a substantial number of them, assumed that they were now free. But not at all. McKinley was not prepared to hand the islands back to Spain, nor to set up an international protectorate, nor to leave them alone, exposed to the wicked designs of other nations.

But the Filipinos, like the Vietnamese in 1945, thought that they had helped win their independence, and did not want any foreign, certainly not any Western, power to take over. They thought that independence from Spain meant an end to colonialism, and they were outraged when McKinley calmly assumed that they had nothing to say about their fate. It did not, apparently, occur to McKinley that the Filipinos would oppose American rule of the islands, and when they did so, he reacted impulsively, almost instinctively, as we later reacted to Vietcong intransigence. He struck back, and we found ourselves engaged in just the kind of jungle warfare in which we are now once again embroiled.

That war dragged on for three years, and before it was over it had engaged 120,000 American troops—the equivalent then of our 300,000 now in Vietnam—and cost almost as many lives as the war with Spain. Like almost all wars between people of different races and colors, between a highly civilized and a more primitive people, this war speedily degenerated into the worst kind of guerrilla fighting, with barbarities and torture on both sides. Within a short time the United States found itself doing in the Philippines what it had condemned Spain for doing in Cuba, just as now we find ourselves doing in Vietnam what we condemned the Germans for doing in the last war.

The First World War affords the best—perhaps the only—example of a war which we entered upon deliberately. We moved toward war with our eyes open; we calculated the risks of fighting, and of not fighting; our decision to declare war was carefully weighed and calculated. Whatever the rights and wrongs of that decision—and looking back on it from the perspective of fifty years, there still seem to be more rights than wrongs—it cannot be alleged that this was an occasion where events overrode human judgment. We did not, of course, see the consequences of our involvement; even the eye of Woodrow Wilson could not penetrate that far into the future.

With the Second World War we were clearly back in the world of chance. Granted,

Roosevelt had not been a passive spectator to the drama unfolding before us in Europe and in Asia; granted too, that by 1941 we had moved, somewhat erratically, toward participation in a "shooting" war, with conscription swelling the ranks of our armed forces, our airplane and munitions factories working day and night, our protection extended to Iceland, and our Navy prepared to shoot submarines on sight. But the election of 1940, like that of 1916, had been fought on a platform that appeared to promise that the government would stay out of "foreign" wars. Public opinion was, in fact, unprepared for war in 1941. And when war came, it came not by our choice, but by the choice of Japan. Once again it could be said that we did not control events, events controlled us. We did not plan the war, controlling each move in a complex game; there were calculations, but they went awry; the moves and finally the game itself got out of hand.

The Korean War does not fit quite so neatly into this pattern of wars into which the United States blundered or strayed, but whatever else may be said of it, this can be said with certainty, that it was not a war we either anticipated or planned. The Korean War caught us by surprise as it caught most of the world by surprise, and so, too, did the ferocity of the fighting. The analogy to our involvement in Vietnam is not far-fetched: We plunged into what we took for a war of aggression; as we moved ever closer to the China boundary, China concluded that it was threatened (as indeed it was by MacArthur and the war hawks, though not by Truman) and itself plunged into the war. We are confident now that escalation of the Vietnam war will not bring in China, but our experience in Korea does not justify that confidence. Nor does it justify our confidence that we can, in the end, impose our will on all participants; in Korea we had to settle for something less than total victory, and to accept an armistice which still hangs over us.

Now, once again, we are involved in a war that began, quite fortuitously, as a minor action and developed into a major one. Because public relations, propaganda, and perhaps pride, are more insistent than ever before, we are assured, more persuasively than ever before, that everything is under control. No need to fear a further enlargement of the war; no need to fear war with China; no need to fear an atomic conflict. But the one thing that is inescapably clear is that nothing is really under control. Month after month, year after year, we have been misled and deceived. We have been told that the conflict in Vietnam was not a real war, that a show of force would bring it to an end; that the Vietcong were being decimated, and were deserting by the thousands; that a few days' bombing would bring North Vietnam to its knees; that we had at last set up a stable government; that the South Vietnamese army was a real fighting force; that the long-awaited social and land reforms were finally being fulfilled; that we had staunch allies who would surely come to our aid. But why go on? The record of no other war in our history is so littered with the bric-a-brac of miscalculations, misguided policies, and mistaken predictions.

Yet those responsible for this matchless record of confusion, self-deception, and error still have the temerity to assure us that everything is under control—their control. We are still asked to believe that the President and his advisors make all the decisions and direct all the actions, that they can calculate with certainty just how far the war will go and how far it will not go; that they can move the pieces on the chessboard of Asia with such deftness and skill that we need never fear that anything will go awry.

Confidence in our ability to control the war in which we are now so hopelessly en-

tangled is part of that larger intellectual and moral vanity which is one of the most frightening features of the American character today. It is of a piece with those games theories which so fascinate the servants of the Rand Corporation, of a piece with Henry Kissinger's careful calculations of the tolerable limit of losses in a nuclear war—is it 50 per cent or 70?—of a piece with Herman Kahn's theory of controlled escalation of atomic warfare, all as neat and impersonal as a computer.

Those whom the gods would destroy they first make vain. To suppose that we are a special people, that we can not only foresee but control the future, that we can bestride the swift currents of history, that the choice of life and death for nations and even for Mankind has been delivered into our hands—this is a special and fearful kind of arrogance and pride. Nothing in our experience promises us that we can subdue the arrogance or conquer the pride.

#### "THE COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY REFLEX"—ARTICLE BY CONOR CRUISE O'BRIEN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Columbia University Forum, a distinguished former international civil servant makes some perceptive and enlightening comments on the problems of conducting American foreign policy in a world of sometimes violent social upheaval.

Conor Cruise O'Brien, a former member of the Irish delegation to the United Nations, and a representative of the Secretary General in the Congo in 1961, has observed firsthand some of the difficulties arising when a world power involves itself in the political affairs of nations whose masses are poor and politically inarticulate. He urges, and I think wisely so, extreme caution in employing ideological arguments in international affairs, and urges policymakers to be somewhat humble in determining just what is, and what is not, acceptable political change abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. O'Brien's article, "The Counterrevolutionary Reflex," be printed in the Record at this point.

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

#### THE COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY REFLEX (By Conor Cruise O'Brien)

It is widely asserted, and believed, that social revolution can be peacefully accomplished. I can accept this as a reasonable hypothesis when applied to the so-called pockets of poverty in this country and other rich countries, where available resources are large in relation to the scale of the problem, where there is a relatively alert and far-seeing ruling class, and where social changes of the magnitude required may well be consistent with the interests of the ruling class. Even in rich countries an increase in sporadic violence seems likely, but it seems highly unlikely that the relation of violence to change will be such as to deserve the name revolution in anything but the rhetorical or declamatory sense.

In the poor world, or the poor part of the third world, the situation is qualitatively different. Throughout most of the area the oppressed are not minorities but the masses, and they are confronted by ruling classes that cling avidly to their traditional large share of scarce resources. The interests of the ruling classes are simply not consistent

with any social change in the interests of the people as a whole. The landowners, users, sweat-shop owners, corrupt political bosses, and parasitic bureaucrats who now control in varying combinations most governments of the third world are precisely those people who must be deprived of their *raison d'être* if there is to be a social revolution. Why should these people allow themselves to be peacefully ousted as long as they have the money to pay others to defend their interests? Such defense need not always be as obvious as the employment of white mercenaries by the government of the Congo. Rulers of most poor countries, by reason of that very poverty, can recruit mercenaries from among their own people. This method is less conspicuous than the Congolese method, but it is also less reliable because the danger of defection and mutiny is inescapable when national forces are used in a revolutionary situation. This danger, in turn, can give rise to a demand for extra-national, counterrevolutionary forces—Belgian regular troops in the nominally independent Congo, French regular troops in nominally independent Gabon, U.S. regular troops in nominally independent Santo Domingo and South Vietnam.

If the line of reasoning is correct, and recent history seems to support it, then it is not likely that social revolution will occur without political revolution; political revolution will be opposed by force, and cannot prevail without greater force. The forms that political revolutions take and the relations they bear to social change vary according to the widely differing social realities of the regions covered. What seems certain, however, is that change of the dimensions implied by the term "social revolution" is not accomplished without political change of corresponding dimensions—that is, without political revolution. Even Japan, sometimes cited as an example of social revolution without political revolution, actually went through two political revolutions, one in the last century and one in this.

Ruling classes, about to be overwhelmed in their own country, will look outside their country for military help, or will actually receive that help, without looking for it, from outsiders who either have important interests of their own in the country concerned, or judge their general network of international interests threatened by the combination of political and society revolution in any country. The former was the case of Belgium in the Congo, and France in Gabon; the latter has become the established position of the government of the United States.

At a given moment then, social revolution in any country, having taken political form, provokes the use of violence, first national and then—if successful—probably international. When violence threatens to cross national boundaries, the United Nations comes into the matter, at least in theory, for the purpose of that organization, in the words of the first line of the first article of the Charter, is "to maintain international peace and security." However, what the UN does or can do in places where social revolution threatens international peace depends largely on the international posture of the United States. This country is not only the greatest and richest of world powers, with widespread economic, financial, diplomatic and military influence, but it is also the major contributor to the UN budget, and as such exercises a predominant influence over UN policies, decisions and—most important of all—interpretation of policies at the level of the Secretariat. This situation is widely recognized in the world at large—not only in the Communist world, but also in Western Europe, Latin America and elsewhere. Only in this country does the illusion persist that the UN is an organization run by Africans for the purpose of thwarting and tormenting Uncle Sam. It is an illusion that has its

## HOW THE U.S. RATES

Although the United States has been creating new companies and institutions in recent years, it is still far behind Europe with its state and municipally supported theaters, opera houses and orchestras.

Glance through the roster of Fulbright alumni and you will discover how many have gone on to useful and even distinguished careers and positions in this country.

Among the composers there are Leslie Bassett, this year's Pulitzer Prize-winner; Jack Beeson, Maurice Bonney, Lukas Foss, Lee Hoiby, Ulysses Kay, Donald Martino and George Rochberg.

The concert pianists include Gary Graffman and Ivan Davis and the solo violinist include Berl Senofsky and Sylvia Rosenberg.

Among the conductors have been Loren Mazael, Newell Jenkins and Thomas Dunn. The singers have gone to berths in the leading opera houses of Europe and have appeared at the outstanding festivals. Some have started modestly in provincial lyric theaters and, thanks to the chance to be heard, have been engaged for better roles in more important opera houses. The Metropolitan Opera has hired more than a dozen, including Irene Dalis, Ezio Flagello, Gladys Kuchta, Anna Moffo, Grace Hofman and Teresa Stich Randall. Others have appeared with the New York City, Chicago and San Francisco Operas.

Among the theater people have been Alan Schneider, Allen Fletcher and William Ball, directors who have been influential not only on and off Broadway but also in resident companies across the country.

Among the painters and sculptors have been Jack Levine, Lee Bontecue, Dimitri Hadzi, Louis Finkelstein and Elias Friedensohn.

Add to the creators and performers a limited but select group of scholars in the arts who have received awards and you get the full measure of the program's scope. Many of the researchers and lecturers who have gone abroad under the aegis of the Fulbright Act have come home to teach a new generation of scholars.

The faculties of our universities and colleges have a generous sprinkling of Fulbright alumni. Six out of 32 members of the art department at the University of California in Berkeley have held exchange fellowships.

## GETTING THE RIGHT PEOPLE

There are 16 screening committees ranging from cinematography to wind instruments set up by the Institute of International Education to review the applicants and choose the awards winners. Then binational commissions representing the host countries and the United States meet to make sure that there is a proper niche for artist, performer or scholar. There is considerable give and take in the operation of these commissions.

Once they go abroad the award winners enjoy a great deal of freedom and flexibility. They are assumed to be adults who are eager to make the most fruitful use of their year abroad. They receive travel and maintenance expenses and in special cases additional allowances for books and other supplies.

In other generations the scions of the rich went abroad for their Wanderjahr, the year of wandering and absorption of European culture. Now it is the Government through the State Department that makes possible a fruitful year abroad for many gifted young Americans.

Its reward is that it receives back from Europe men and women whose talents have been sharpened and whose horizons have been broadened. In their own work and in their influence on others they contribute to the nation's cultural flowering.

## BENEVOLENT INVASION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, following that, there was published in the Times Literary Supplement of Thursday, July 14, 1966, a review of a book by Walter Johnson and Francis J. Colligan relating to the Fulbright program, published by the University of Chicago Press. The review is of a book relating to the same program, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a part of the Record.

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

## BENEVOLENT INVASION

(Walter Johnson and Francis J. Colligan: *The Fulbright Program*. 380 pp. University of Chicago Press. £3 3s.)

The Master of Pembroke (Oxford), Senator FULBRIGHT's old college, said of him that his famous "Program" had done more for the spread of learning than any event since the fall of Constantinople. All over the world Fulbright fellows are spread like an invading army of benevolent and fertilizing locusts. Their effect was that of Attila's horse in reverse.

Few junior senators like Senator FULBRIGHT have so quickly and so deservedly found fame and left a monument more enduring. This candid, illuminating and lively history tells of the growing pains and of the vicissitudes of the Program since it was started in a world in which all continents were in desperate need. If today the case is altered, if the needs of the mother countries of the American people are no longer in the forefront, more than ever the Program has taken the world for its parish and its beneficence can be seen everywhere; in Peru if not in modern China, from Ibadan to Calcutta.

Of course, the authors of the survey do not think that the Program was totally a novelty. It was not accidental that its eponymous hero had been (like so many of the rulers of modern America) a Rhodes scholar. The great foundations, especially the Rockefeller Foundation, had pioneered, and the Fulbright Program gained a great deal from the experience, won so hardly by Rockefeller, Ford, Carnegie, Harkness and the rest. The political talents (and courage) of the founder were significant. Naturally he and Senator Joe McCarthy were set on collision course, a collision in which the junior senator from Wisconsin had the worst of it. The world will little note or remember what Joe did (if the world is wise) but the achievement of the Fulbright Program will outlive, if not the palace of the Escorial, at any rate the achievements of the only Arkansas statesman who has rivalled Senator FULBRIGHT in international eminence, Governor Orville Faubus.

On the whole, the Program was lucky. It fended off, with little difficulty, the intrusions of congressmen. It made mistakes but is recovered from them. It taught the British academic community that there were serious American institutions outside the Ivy League and the eastern establishment and that there were serious academic institutions in Britain apart from Oxbridge. It even shook the complacency of the Sorbonne and provided a way for the German academy to work its passage back into the Republic of Letters.

The Program had more and more to do with the underprivileged world. It had to deal with the rival claims of Tagalog and English in the Philippines and corresponding problems in India.

It has also educated many Americans away from the "PX" attitude to the heathen dwelling in outer darkness. It has spread

Keynesian economics in Japan as a rival doctrine to Marxism—thus running the risk of infuriating the numerous Americans for whom Keynes was simply a more dangerous because more insinuating Marx. It spread music in the narrow as well as in the wider sense. It even promoted, through its fellows, gymnastics. It had the honour of violent abuse from *L'Humanité* and it accepted the criticism of scholars like the late Perry Miller that the Program must not be seen in America as a way of selling "Americanism". It has been a great and beneficent success.

It would be unjust to say that Mr. Johnson and Mr. Colligan, like a sundial, note only the sunny hours. There are inevitable differences between hosts and guests. The Americans an institution would most welcome may not be available or not be sent to the institution or country where they would be most at home and, from a purely academic point of view, most useful. Scholars were sent to remote corners of the mission field who would rather have tilled lusher fields. Empire-building in the State Department had to be resisted. But all things considered, the snafus, even the bureaucratic snafus were few. And unlike the emigration from Constantinople, the Program worked both ways. It benefited the United States as much as it benefited the outer world. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Colligan, naturally enough, in writing for an American audience, made allusions not necessarily immediately meaningful to non-American readers. (Not everybody, for instance, will realize that the "Republic of China" is an American euphemism for the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Formosa.) And it is a little distressing to find that the authors mix up the Eastman and Harmsworth chairs at Oxford and ignore the Pitt chair at Cambridge, although the teaching of American history at both of the ancient universities was endowed by British money, that of the first Viscount Rothermere and that of the Cambridge University Press.

## OVERCOMMITTED AND UNDERSUPPORTED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently, on the 8th of September, the Wall Street Journal, which I think all of us recognize as a reputable, very open-minded, and well edited newspaper, had an editorial entitled "Overcommitted and Undersupported." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

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

## OVERCOMMITTED AND UNDERSUPPORTED

The above words express a growing worry on the part of a number of Senators: That the U.S. could become engulfed in more than one brush-fire war at the same time, in increasing isolation from erstwhile allies. There seems ample cause for the concern.

The strains of the Vietnam war alone show how difficult it would be to handle even one other comparable conflict simultaneously. Yet the U.S. has military treaties with upwards of 40 nations.

Moreover, Secretary of State Rusk, while denying that Washington is trying to be policeman for the world, has indicated that it does not consider itself limited to the defense of those 40-odd countries; rather it feels more generally bound to uphold the peace-keeping work of the UN throughout the world. If so, that is an open-ended commitment if there ever was one.

The specter of new outbreaks while we are

September 21, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

status, the intellectual has great opportunities, he also has heavy responsibilities. And these have not been well thought through or defined. Many forces play on him; the policies of his own government and nation; the interests of his university and immediate colleagues; the composition of his own scientific or professional international fraternity; the standards of scholarship and inquiry accepted in his own field; and, not least, his own convictions regarding the universal values and purposes he would like to serve.

All these different forces and influences, unfortunately, do not operate within identical perimeters. He must weigh, measure, sort out and balance. How indeed does he assign priorities? How does he resolve a real confrontation, when it occurs, between his patriotic duty as a citizen and his professional commitment as a man of learning? According to what criteria does he analyze his obligations if, for example, he is tempted to become a statistic in the "brain drain": what weight should he assign to the need of his own less-developed country for his precious talents and training, and what weight to the richer opportunities for professional development and contributions that the job proffered to him in the advanced country presents? Clearly the problems growing out of the intellectual's new role in world affairs are manifold. I believe they are worthy of your serious discussion.

The second question I want to lay before you is not unrelated to the first because it concerns one aspect of the intellectual's responsibility. Here I am concerned with bringing to larger segments of the populations of all countries—to a considerably larger fraction of the world's people—some of the enlightenment gained by the few who are the active agents of international education. Those who work and study outside their countries, those who travel and observe as consultants and study missions, those who reside abroad as exchange professors—they will always be but a tiny percentage of the population of any country.

It is our assumption—or perhaps I should say it is our faith—that something is involved in international educational experience beyond the specific enhancement of the individual's own professional ability—beyond his further training as classicist, botanist, architect or anthropologist. He is also a culture-carrier, one who brings back to his own people general insights into the cultures and societies of others. One of the currently favored terms to describe this process of transmission is "feedback." Considerable attention has been given to this matter, at least in the United States. We have experimented with ways of broadening and enriching the world affairs content of what might be called "life's curriculum"—from a little after the cradle to just this side of the grave. But we have so far still to go!

If indeed our ultimate goal in this entire area of endeavor is to send down ever deeper roots of comity among peoples, then this translation of specialized knowledge into informed public understanding about world affairs should stand near the top of our agenda of unfinished business. We in the United States would like to know how successfully the leaders of other countries have addressed this problem, how they conceive of it within their own societies and what approaches and techniques they have found promising. This second question which I am proposing for inclusion in your discussions here is one in which we in America perhaps have ideas to share, but indeed have much still to learn.

My third question raises some very difficult issues. So far as I am aware, little thought has been given to this matter. It is one that brings us up against the hard facts of international political tensions and

hostilities—but it is still a question which I believe must be squarely faced. It is simply this: How important is it that educational processes, including especially international cooperation in education, continue insofar as possible through periods of abrupt governmental change, domestic turmoil, social instability, civil disturbance, guerrilla warfare, and other forms of internal disruption that seem to be visited on so many countries at this stage of history? And if it is important that education continue, then is it not incumbent upon intellectuals to re-examine many of their assumptions, develop some new implements for their tool kits, and generally refurbish their methods and techniques in international education?

We can most easily portray our traditional ways of thinking about this question—or rather, of not really thinking about it at all—by looking at two extreme situations. On the one hand, we have tended to view the calm and relaxed relationships between the United States and England (or the U.S. and Canada) as really the natural setting for cooperative educational relationships. In that context of amity and understanding, the movement of students and professors and the development of intellectual ties goes on effectively and almost unnoticed. At the other extreme, during the holocaust of World War II, nothing was farther from our thoughts than international cooperation in education (except perhaps with Latin America, far removed from the battlefield).

If we think about the realities of our world today, we know that most sets of international relationships fall somewhere between the tranquility of the United States vis-a-vis the United Kingdom, and the total conflagration of the Second World War. The in-between ground is immense, showing almost every possible gradation and different coloration—from the problems posed by the successive governmental turnovers in Nigeria to the picture of acrimony and total non-relationships between Mainland China and the U.S. Such examples of the "exceptional circumstances" in which educational relationships must function, if they are to exist at all, could be multiplied almost at will. But I am sure that without further elaboration, the issue I am trying to pose for your consideration is clear. The situation for most of the world lies within this area of "exceptional circumstances". Most important of all, the less developed countries that encompass two-thirds of mankind are almost without exception those that are most susceptible to the turmoil of social strife and upheaval. If we could simply overlook this, that would be one thing. How convenient it would be if we could say: "Ah, ha! Upper Marsovia has had a revolutionary upset. We shall just pull out and wait to see whether they can straighten themselves out!" But those countries are precisely the ones that most urgently need the cooperation, assistance and sustenance which the advanced countries can offer. We have to do better—to be capable of greater sophistication of approach—than the old black-and-white analysis allows.

So my final theme for your consideration—put forward with an even greater sense of urgency than the two preceding—is that all of us concerned with the vitality of international education and its full modernization in the real world of the 1960's would do well to ponder how these linkage and relationships can be effectively developed with the South Vietnams, the Dominican Republics, the Indonesias and the Nigerias of this globe. For the intellectual, this is a towering challenge. The terrain is very different from the one over which he is accustomed to move so comfortably.

But it is here that he is called upon to leave a record of accomplishment for history. Otherwise, he is driven back to saying that international cooperation in education is fine for the stable, the prosperous, the ad-

vanced and the enlightened—but the down-trodden and disadvantaged of this earth will have to go on waiting for the benefits it can confer. By his very nature, the intellectual does not wish to write that message into the tablets of history. But for the verdict to be otherwise, we are all called upon to give earnest thought to the ways in which we adjust the patterns and relationships of international education so that they become relevant and meaningful for the millions of human souls in the troubled countries of the world.

I have tried in a sketchy manner to suggest three themes for discussion. The way the intellectual solves the tensions which develop between his duties as citizen and his obligations as scholar; his role as a culture carrier and interpreter; and his responsibility to further educational progress in areas of active conflict and severe political strain.

In the course of the next two days I am confident that our distinguished panelists and participants will introduce many additional themes for discussion.

It is my hope and expectation that our proceedings will be worthy of the great anniversary which is the occasion of our gathering.

## INVESTMENT IN THE ARTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, following that speech by Mr. Wells, I ask unanimous consent that an article relating to the same subject, written by Howard Taubman, published in the New York Times of June 22, 1966, entitled "Investment in the Arts," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times June 22, 1966]  
INVESTMENT IN THE ARTS—FULBRIGHT GRANTS YIELD RICH DIVIDENDS AS ALUMNI'S TALENTS BENEFIT THE NATION

(By Howard Taubman)

If you were asked to guess who has been underwriting the largest program of awards in the arts during the last 20 years, you probably would say the Ford or Rockefeller Foundation. But you would be wrong. It is the State Department through its international exchanges under the 1946 Fulbright Act, so called because the bill was sponsored by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas. It has made a total of 2,350 grants to Americans pursuing studies and careers in the arts. These grants each year constitute 16 to 20 percent of all Fulbright fellowships awarded to Americans. Only the language fields have provided a larger number of Fulbright scholars.

An analysis of the grants in the two decades that the program has been in operation shows that there have been 159 awards in drama, 18 in cinema, 27 in dance, 383 in painting, 83 in sculpture, 342 in architecture, 138 in design, 145 in composition, 53 in conducting, 609 to instrumentalists and 393 to singers.

But even more impressive than the statistics is the significance of the awards both to the individuals who received them and to the United States itself to which they eventually bring back their heightened and polished powers.

For many artists, especially young performing artists, the gravest problem is to find opportunities to employ their skills after they have finished their formal studies. Actors, singers, instrumental soloists and conductors desperately need the equivalent of internships. They require places where they can gain experience, test themselves in different roles and repertoires and develop their talents in an exigent professional ambience.

September 21, 1966

22627

engaged in Vietnam is hardly fanciful. The talk about Thailand gets steadily more ominous, and although warfare there could be viewed as an extension of Vietnam, it would be no less troublesome on that account. The Communists could, if they chose, reopen the Korean front and try to instigate uprisings elsewhere.

Such eventualities, at any rate, fit in with the oft-stated strategic hopes of Red China. The most recent statement, an editorial in a Chinese paper, professes to welcome the American concentration on Asia; "the more forces U.S. imperialism throws into Asia, the more will it be bogged down there and the deeper will be the grave it digs for itself."

Peking also envisions "wars of national liberation" in other parts of the underdeveloped world. The editorial explains it in a somewhat mixed metaphor: With many peoples rising to attack the U.S., "one hitting at its head and the other at its feet, U.S. imperialism can be nibbled up bit by bit."

For their part, President Johnson and his advisers believe the threats should be taken seriously, whatever, anyone may think of Red China's present capacity to carry them out. To the Administration, of course, this is a principal reason for being in Vietnam. If that particular "war of liberation" can be stopped cold, it may persuade Peking to desist from further attempts in Southeast Asia or anywhere else.

It must be hoped it will work out that way, and like most Americans we see no good alternative at this stage to continuing the fight. But assurance is wanting that the U.S. can bring the war to a satisfactory conclusion in any reasonable period of time.

Nor is it by any means certain that a Communist defeat there would in fact make Red China refrain from other aggressions; so far Vietnam apparently is costing the Chinese nothing in men and relatively little in materiel. And the thunderous lack of support the U.S. is getting in the world for its effort in Vietnam suggests how little relish even friendly nations would have for additional entanglements.

The prospect of the U.S., all but alone, embroiled in Vietnams successively or simultaneously for the indefinite future is one that Americans should not be required to accept, no matter how deep their opposition to international communism. The potential drain, it seems to us, is too great in proportion to whatever the possible gains. Somehow the present overextension must be corrected.

An obvious place to start is to cut back the heavy U.S. troop commitment in Europe, as Senator Mansfield now urges (and these columns have argued for years). A token force would be sufficient to keep the Soviets aware that the U.S. would resist an attack on Western Europe, which pledge is NATO's central deterrent.

Even so modest a proposal, however, won instant rejection from the White House, and the rebuff seems symptomatic of the Administration's overextended thinking.

What needs understanding is that the U.S. cannot protect every people in the world from Communist peril without weakening its ability to fight a major war with a major foe should that ever become necessary. The Government has to be more selective, and the proper basis for the selectivity is how directly an aggression impinges on American national interests.

Had that fundamental principle of foreign policy been adhered to, it is doubtful that the U.S. would have stumbled into the Vietnam war in the manner that it has. Before we get any repeat performances, Vietnam should above all stand as a warning of the danger of unlimited commitments and indiscriminate interventions.

### THE SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by Clayton Fritchey relating to South Vietnam.

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

(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—The post election jag in South Vietnam goes on unabated, and the intoxication of Washington officialdom almost equals that of the Saigon generals, who are described as "almost delirious with joy."

Premier Ky and the other leaders of the military dictatorship are hailing the election as a "triumph for democracy," a "smashing victory" for the government, and a testimonial to the ruling junta.

The President of the U.S. has added his own beaming benediction: "The large turnout," he said, "is to me a vote of confidence." Confidence in what?

If the American people swallow the new Ky-Johnson line, they will again end up disappointed and disillusioned, just as they have in the past when the truth ultimately deflated previous propaganda fantasies.

It is better to face up to the truth at once, and the truth is that the Vietnam election (if it can honestly be called that) is by no stretch of the imagination a testimonial to Gen. Ky's military government.

No one yet knows what the election results really mean, or even portend, so Ky and his U.S. supporters simply proclaim that the mere size of the turnout (also in dispute) is in itself an endorsement of the government.

Yet the one, indisputable, fact seems to be that if the vote is a testimonial to anything at all, it is to the people's deep desire to have an elected, civilian government, and not a self-imposed military one, such as Ky presently heads up.

Just how that constitutes a ringing affirmation of the Ky junta is something that baffles disinterested observers, most of whom see the election as a strong expression of popular will for replacing the generals with a constitutional, representative government.

If that is so, why are the generals so elated? They are jubilant because they think they have succeeded (temporarily at least) in acquiring the protective coloring of a democratic election, without running any risks to their own future. They think they have fixed it so that they are safe no matter what happens. And they are probably right in this estimate.

According to the Chief of State, Gen. Van Thieu, the election was "a victory for the entire free world over international Communism." Since the junta did not permit any reds or even neutralists to run for the assembly, it is not clear how the election could have been a test of Communism, for it was never an issue during the campaign.

The victory claims come down to Ky's Orwellian proposition that the junta was "for" elections, and the Buddhists and Vietcong were "against" them, and therefore the balloting was a vote for him and a rebuke to his enemies.

As everyone knows, the only reason the elections were held in the first place is that the Buddhists forced Ky to call them. Last spring, it took weeks of demonstrations, violence, and fiery immolations to exact an electoral promise from the junta. The Buddhists have never been pro-Communist or pro-Vietcong. They simply fought for elections and representative government until the militarists grudgingly gave in.

Confronted with the necessity of going through with elections, the generals cleverly made the most of the situation by (1) screening all candidates for the constituent

assembly, and (2) arranging it so that any new constitution will have to be just what the junta ordered.

The Buddhist answer was to boycott the election on the grounds that it had been turned into a "farce." They have never been "against" elections, but only against debasing them.

All that happened on September 11 is that the embattled people of Vietnam, subjected so long to military tyranny, decided that even a rigged election was better than no election at all.

No doubt the hopes of many unsophisticated Vietnamese, especially in the provinces, have been momentarily raised by the joy of just casting a ballot; and no doubt many Americans would like to believe Premier Ky's statement that the election means "a brighter, more beautiful future" for his nation.

The only fly in this unctuous ointment is that in the 10 years of South Vietnam's history there have been a dozen military governments, and none of these regimes, including Ky's, has yet been able to find a place for the people in the country's "beautiful future."

### OUR COMMITMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during the last few weeks there have been two or three notable occurrences in regard to our commitment in southeast Asia, notably Pope Paul's appeal for peace, directed, of course, to all of the world, and particularly to the half billion Catholics. I think his encyclical dealing with this subject was an outstanding document and deserves the serious consideration of our political leaders and all Members of this body. I certainly wish to join in applauding the statement of Pope Paul.

In that connection, the statement of the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, and his three points, should be mentioned. I only wish to say again that if our Government would pursue his suggestions, there might be some possibility of progress in the effort to stop the gradual escalation of the war in southeast Asia.

I refer also to the New York Times Sunday magazine section in which there appeared an article by Arthur Schlesinger dealing with this matter.

Mr. Richard Goodwin made a speech entitled "No Wider War," taking, for the major part of his speech, the same theme the President took during his election campaign in 1964. I commend that speech of Mr. Goodwin's to the Senate. It states very eloquently, in the lowest common denominator, what the situation is with regard to southeast Asia.

It seems to me that nearly everyone except the most rabid warmongers could agree that we do not desire a wider, broader, or more extensive war than we now have. If we can agree upon that; if this Government, our enemies, and our allies could agree that the war is not to be extended, that might give us a pause which would allow our diplomats and our political leaders to find a way out of a very dangerous situation.

Finally, I wish again to pay tribute to the majority leader for his statements in this field and his initiative with regard to reducing substantially our troops

in Europe. I think if his advice were taken more seriously by our leaders, we would be much better off. I pay him tribute.

NATIONAL UNICEF DAY—SENATE  
JOINT RESOLUTION 194

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President on behalf of myself and 25 other Senators, I introduce a joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day.

This joint resolution (S.J. Res. 194) is identical to Senate Joint Resolution 144, as favorably reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. That resolution was just interred, the victim of the prayer amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 194.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 194) to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am entirely in favor of this measure. I am drawing on my recollection now, but I believe that it is a fact that contributions made by individuals to UNICEF, such as those received on the famous "trick-or-treat" tour that the children take at Halloween, whereby a good deal of money is collected for UNICEF, and which is a marvelous demonstration of the children's feeling for it, are not tax deductible. Is the Senator to tell us whether that has been checked into at all?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not able to give the Senator a firm answer to that question, as to the tax deductibility of contributions to UNICEF.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that they are not tax deductible, and I should like to use this occasion, when we are establishing a point of honor to UNICEF, to make another point which, perhaps, will do that organization as much good as honor. Though honor is great, they can certainly use more money.

Many such voluntary contributions in this country are tax deductible, and I believe that more contributions for this extremely deserving cause, the United Nations Children's Fund, could be obtained if we would give it some degree of tax exemption. I do not see any reason why it should not be a complete tax exemption. I hope very much that some consideration may be given by the administration—who would have to request it—to this matter. We have been after them for a long time, and I shall keep after them. But I suggest and urge, at

this point, that that be done. As well as doing UNICEF honor, let us also do it some good.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. I think his remarks are well taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 194) is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolutions (S.J. Res. 194) was passed, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating October 31 as National UNICEF Day, inviting the Governors and mayors of State and local governments of the United States to issue similar proclamations, and urging all Americans, both adults and children, in their traditional spirit of good will, to continue and to strengthen their support of UNICEF, not only as individuals but also through their schools, their churches, and other community organizations.*

The preamble was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 2, 1964, FOR PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN LANDS UTILIZED FOR DITCHES AND CANALS IN RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1586, H.R. 9976.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9976) to amend the act of September 2, 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] for calling this matter up. I wish to express my gratitude to the chairman of the subcommittee and to all the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This measure (H.R. 9976) is presented to us exactly as it passed the House of Representatives. The bill will do what we intended to do in 1964. It is a corrective measure.

I call attention to one statement that the House of Representatives put in their hearings:

Enactment of H.R. 9976 will involve little increase in expenditures over those now required by Public Law 88-561.

Mr. President, what we do here today is what we intended to do when the previous act was passed. The bill provides compensation for lands taken for canal purposes, which is already the law. It merely provides jurisdiction for the courts, so that the determination of the amount of compensation can be carried out as originally intended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an excerpt from the report (No. 1619), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

H.R. 9976 and a companion measure, S. 2297, introduced by Senators CURTIS and HRUSKA propose an amendment to Public Law 88-561 (78 Stat. 808, 43 U.S.C. 945a) authorizing suits in Federal district courts to determine just compensation in the event that the landowner and the United States fail to agree on the value of the lands involved. In addition, it will permit the United States, through the Secretary of the Interior, to compensate landowners for canal rights-of-way reserved to it in patents issued by the States.

BACKGROUND

An 1890 act of Congress (26 Stat. 371) required a reservation to the United States of rights-of-way for canals and ditches to be incorporated in all patents for lands west of the 100th meridian, after October 2, 1888. In the last Congress, the 1890 act was amended by Public Law 88-561 so that the United States could compensate property owners for lands utilized in connection with the Federal reclamation program notwithstanding the reservations required by the act of 1890. Many Western States, following the Federal policy, disposed of State lands with a similar reservation for canals and ditches to the United States. While the 1964 act authorized the United States to pay compensation for reserved rights-of-way contained in patents from the Federal Government, it did not authorize compensation for those holding State issued patents containing a similar reservation to the United States.

H.R. 9976, if enacted, would resolve this inequitable inconsistency by allowing landowners who trace their title to a patent issued by a State, to be compensated like those whose title runs from a patent from the Federal Government.

Another aspect of H.R. 9976 involves the question of where the amount of the compensation to be paid to the landowners is to be determined. The committee recommends, in the event of disagreement between the United States and the landowner as to the value of the land within the right-of-way, that the Federal district courts should ascertain the amount which would constitute just compensation. It was felt by the committee that the landowner should not be handicapped with the burden of accepting, without recourse, the offer tendered by the United States, or of bringing suit to the Court of Claims.

DISCUSSION

In 1964, the Congress had before it the report of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which outlined the need for the revision of the 1890 act. It was pointed out, at that time, that when the Congress required, as it did in 1890, the incorporation of canal and ditch reservations in all patents for lands west of the 100th meridian, it probably contemplated a right-of-way 75 to 100 feet in width. Contrary to that early concept, the report indicated the rights-of-way required now are often many times that width. Since the easement was not fixed in size nor limited



22636

cially high rates for lake ports, thus precluding their use by DOD.

DOD annually spends \$400 million on this commercial sealift. By putting it on a strictly competitive basis, DOD will be saving the taxpayer tens of millions of dollars a year. Great Lakes shippers will be able to bid competitively for a substantial share of these military cargo shipments.

#### ALL-ASIA CONFERENCE FIRST PROPOSED BY SENATOR MILLER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, an important account of Senator JACK MILLER's contribution to everyone's thinking about the war in Vietnam was published last week in the Senate Republican memo, which is sent to Senators on our side of the aisle by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee. The weekly memo is a compilation of facts on affairs of Government. This particular account deals with the All-Asian Conference which the junior Senator from Iowa originally conceived.

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

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

#### SENATOR MILLER RECORDED AS FIRST TO SUGGEST ALL-ASIA VIET MEETING

It was Republican Senator JACK MILLER of Iowa who first suggested, on the record, the idea of a possible all-Asian conference which might lead to settlement of the Viet Nam war. His suggestion (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 25, 1966, p. 3942, 3rd column), came in the course of a wide-ranging address to the Senate on the background, legality, and buildup of the war in Southeast Asia.

Senator MILLER also pointed out at the time that if the Asian nations could join together in an all-Asian Development Bank for economic development in that area of the world, "they ought to be able to join together to seek peace in their area."

Senator MILLER pointed out in his address the present Viet Nam mess could well have developed the way it did because of the temporizing of the Administration with the glaring violations by Hanoi of the Geneva agreement on Laos. The United States pulled out its troops but several thousand Red troops remained. It was not until February 1965, Senator MILLER said, that it was made clear to North Viet Nam there would be no privileged sanctuary above the 17th Parallel.

#### CHET HUNTLEY ANALYZES U THANT'S STATEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, much has been heard in recent days about the statement made by United Nations Secretary General U Thant.

References were made to the war in South Vietnam which have been interpreted in many different ways. I believe one of the most interesting analysis of Mr. Thant's statement was made Tuesday, September 20, 1966, by the nationally known radio and television commentator, Mr. Chet Huntley, in a program broadcast by the National Broadcasting Co.

Because it gives a clear commonsense analysis of the statement, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement placed in the RECORD.

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

#### CHET HUNTLEY ANALYZES U THANT'S STATEMENT

Considerable attention is being given today to the report of U.N. Secretary General Thant to the General Assembly, which is to convene tomorrow. This is another typical Thant statement, vague and wanting in precision. If this is his official swan song to the international organization, the Secretary General might have done better than placing into the record another round of platitudes. This report is another one which can be interpreted in almost any way the reader chooses.

U Thant's report to the United Nations today contained some comments on the war in Viet Nam. He deplored what he called the tendency to regard the struggle as a Holy War of differing ideologies. He said that it cannot or should not be resolved by power politics but rather by patience and with consideration for the people of South and North Viet Nam. The New Times, both on the front page and on its editorial page, interprets U Thant's remarks on Viet Nam as a stern rebuke for the United States. This may not be surprising in that the Times' editorial stance in respect to Viet Nam has frequently been as nebulous as many of Thant's remarks. The Times appears to urge that the United States stay on in South Viet Nam but that it refrain from employing any more men or weapons.

Is the American presence in Viet Nam one in behalf of a Holy War of different ideologies? In other words, are we in Viet Nam only to stop communism? It does seem that it might be reasonably and forcibly argued that, that does not define our policy or that it is a gross over-simplification.

We are certainly in Viet Nam to try to get communism to stop realizing its objective by force. The fact that the United States has made every conceivable offer to negotiate would seem to demonstrate that we have no illusions about wiping out communism in Southeast Asia. If we are engaged in an ideological war, something must surely be said about the ideology of the right of self determination. We have had demonstrations and proof over and over again that there are people in Viet Nam who choose to resist the communist reach for the southern part of the country by using force. And American ideology to wipe out communism in Southeast Asia or anywhere else would be unwise and unworkable, if the ideology of the self determination of people in such ill repute that it deserves to be discarded. And what about the widely advertised communist ideology. Does it somehow deserve to write the order for the world?

In short, U Thant has not done a great service to the world by calling this a Holy War of differing ideologists. Precisely, whose ideology is so repulsive or which one is to yield when communist ideology confronts the ideology of self determination?

#### INFLATION WARNINGS CONTINUE TO APPEAR

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I do not know how many storm warnings must be sounded before this administration will take steps to restore stability to the national economy. The rate of inflation apparently does not yet alarm this administration. But the pressures increase and warnings continue to appear.

Yesterday it was suggested by the President that higher rate U.S. bonds might be available to regular purchasers of U.S. savings bonds. The reason given was that this would help the Govern-

ment finance the Vietnam war. This fact is misleading. The Government issues bonds because it spends more than it receives in taxes. The deficit must be made up by Government borrowing and the Government borrows today not only because of the cost of the Vietnam conflict, but because of its Great Society spending.

The morning press also notes that the Senate Labor Committee appears ready to approve an antipoverty authorization of \$2.7 billion—nearly \$1 billion more than the administration has requested.

The sale of bonds, which is the issuance of Government notes, is necessary, not just because of the Vietnam costs, but because Great Society spending programs, inspired by political expediency, executed in waste and being only sham solutions for some of the serious American problems in the mid-1960's.

Moreover, Mr. President, the increased bond rate is motivated by another condition—an even louder storm warning. Existing savings bonds pay 4.15 percent to maturity and may be redeemed at any time. The current pace of redemption is a source of concern, it is said, to the Treasury Department.

In this connection, I am reminded of an article by my friend W. L. White in the August issue of the Reader's Digest wherein he writes of the rising risk of runaway inflation:

During most of our country's history, gold has served as a valuable alarm system—and has given the citizen a check on his government. If the government was extravagantly spending more than it took in, so that its credit became shaky, a citizen could protect himself against inflation by demanding and getting gold for his paper money at any bank. These withdrawals could constitute a stern warning to government and banks to put their affairs in order.

Today the American people no longer have this protection, or this check on government extravagance. Our dollar is still distantly linked to gold, since our Treasury will still redeem its paper money by selling gold bars abroad at the rate of 35 paper dollars per ounce. But only foreign central banks or foreign governments may buy these bars. An American citizen violates the law by buying, selling or owning one.

Mr. President, the rate of redemption of U.S. savings bonds is precisely the same type of action U.S. citizens formerly used when they demanded gold for paper money. Today the redemption rate is the citizen's way of telling his government to put its fiscal affairs in order.

Mr. President, recently the President proposed that the 7-percent tax credit for industrial expansion and retooling be suspended along with accelerated depreciation. He further proposed that a series of talks be initiated and that the Government departments make every move to curtail expenditures. This has been characterized by many as a weak proposal which came too late to be effective. Indeed business expansion and purchase of equipment and inventories will only be accelerated by this proposal. And the talks if initiated only now come too late. They should have been the concern of the Government for more than a year.

A reduction of Federal expenditures offers a real answer, but who among us

September 21, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22635

Mrs. Cooley cited an example of why Rep. MORRISON is unable to call on open Administration help in his campaign.

She said Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY "unwittingly" hurt Rep. MORRISON'S chances in a recent speech in Louisiana during which he made some impromptu remarks on racial rioting.

"We know Mr. HUMPHREY didn't intend to hurt Mr. MORRISON," she said, "but his speech was awful. He said something about leading riots and it was just the wrong thing."

## NO HELP

(She was apparently referring to a July 18 speech in New Orleans when Mr. HUMPHREY said if he'd had to live in a ghetto with rats nibbling on his children's toes, he might "lead a mighty good revolt" himself.)

Less than two weeks after the HUMPHREY speech, Rep. MORRISON took his election campaign to a Miami Beach, Fla., convention of the American Federation of Government Employees, where he told delegates that "Victory, this time, is spelled on m-o-n-e-y!"

His office said yesterday the congressman was simply "joking", but AFGE president John Griner had told the convention at the time that collection boxes had been placed outside the hall and that "anybody who wants to donate, can."

"This is purely voluntary," he told the delegates, but "you know where it's going."

[From the Des Moines Register, Sept. 21, 1966]

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Post Office Department has "loaned" a \$9,000-a-year secretary to Democratic Congressman JAMES MORRISON at a time he is engaged in a heated runoff political campaign in Louisiana.

Charles Johnson, staff director of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, confirmed that he made the arrangements to borrow the secretary, Mrs. June Lyle from the Office of Assistant Postmaster General William McMillan.

McMillan took full responsibility for the arrangement from the Post Office, and said that as far as he knew Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien "doesn't know a thing about it."

Johnson said Tuesday that Mrs. Lyle was borrowed on a "sort of a quid pro quo arrangement" the committee has with the Post Office Department.

"We like to scratch each others backs," Johnson said. "We are helpful to these agencies from time to time, and they help us out when we're in a press."

Mrs. Lyle was reported by Johnson to be assigned to work for a House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee. Actually she has been at work last week and this week in MORRISON'S congressional office in the Rayburn Office Building.

The "press" of business that necessitated the request for a Post Office secretary in this instance was the press of the bitter runoff campaign for the Democratic nomination for Sixth District Congressman in Louisiana.

MORRISON, the ranking member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, is the heir apparent to the chairmanship of the committee. He is in serious political difficulty because of his support of the Johnson administration on a broad range of subjects including spending programs and civil rights.

Although a veteran of 24 years in the House, MORRISON failed to poll 51 percent of the votes cast in the five-man Democratic primary in August and is now in a two-man runoff against John E. Rarick, a former county judge.

The race has included charges by MORRISON that Rarick is a member of the Ku Klux Klan, a charge that Rarick denies. Rarick has filed a \$500,000 damage suit against MORRISON in connection with the charges.

Rarick charges that MORRISON is a rubber stamp for the Johnson administration on civil rights and other programs. While the spending of the Johnson administration is reported to be an issue, it is the civil rights issue that is most heated.

Mrs. Florence Cooley, an administrative aide to MORRISON, explained the "frantic" race that has "everyone in the office working on the campaign."

She explained that "the Johnson administration is so hated that a lot of the voters would rather support the Klan."

Mrs. Cooley said that MORRISON has "a wonderful relationship" with the Johnson administration, but that it is impossible for President Johnson, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY or other high administration figures to give him any support in the open.

HUMPHREY "unwittingly" had done much damage to MORRISON with a speech in July, Mrs. Cooley said. She said that HUMPHREY had tried to help MORRISON with a speech in Louisiana, but that "it was one of the worst speeches ever."

"We know Mr. HUMPHREY didn't intend to hurt Mr. MORRISON, but his speech was awful," Mrs. Cooley said. "He said something about leading riots and it was just the wrong thing."

She referred to the speech HUMPHREY gave on July 18, 1966, in New Orleans in which he said that if he had lived in a ghetto with rats nibbling on his children's clothes, he "might lead a mighty good revolt" himself. That speech has come in for widespread criticism from Republicans, as well as conservative Southern Democrats.

Mrs. Cooley said that MORRISON had not expected a close race in the primary in which there were five candidates, but his opponents had put a James E. Morrison in the race "to confuse the voters." The James E. Morrison, a Baton Rouge grocer, polled 6,681 votes which Mrs. Cooley said was enough to block MORRISON from polling the necessary 51 percent in the primary.

"Mr. MORRISON didn't even know he (HUMPHREY) was coming down there, and he said later he would have been better off if he'd never come down here," Mrs. Cooley said.

The labor organizations are solidly behind MORRISON, Mrs. Cooley said, "especially those letter carrier groups." She said the postal workers and other Government employees who favor MORRISON "can't do anything because of the Hatch Act" which forbids active political campaigning by career Government employees.

Ira Kapenstein, the Post Office Department public relations officer, said he did not know the policy or the law relative to loaning employees to work for a Congressman during a campaign.

McMillan said that he did not know that Mrs. Lyle was going to work in MORRISON'S office. He said he received a call from Johnson who told him there was "a heavy work load" and that the House committee needed an experienced secretary for one or two weeks.

McMillan said he had assumed that Mrs. Lyle was working in a committee office.

"I run the Operations Division of the Post Office," McMillan said. "I can't spend all my time running around to find out where these people are."

Kapenstein said he believed that McMillan "had a right to rely on statements from Johnson that she was working for the House committee."

McMillan said that the loaning of Mrs. Lyle was done with the understanding that the House Committee would "reimburse" the Post Office Department for the time she worked at the Capitol.

Under questioning, McMillan said there was no written record made of the arrangements with Johnson for the "loan" of the services of Mrs. Lyle or the "reimbursement."

"It was just a telephone conversation," McMillan said. "When Mrs. Lyle came back, the Post Office Department would simply bill the committee for that part of her salary."

He said he saw nothing wrong with the Post Office Department loaning an employee to the House Committee or to a Congressman. He said he was "not familiar with the Hatch Act" and could not say if it was proper or improper for a career Post Office employee to engage in work that helped MORRISON in a political campaign.

"I would defer to Mr. Kapenstein on that," McMillan said.

In answer to a question, Kapenstein said, "It would be improper for a Post Office employee to engage in political work." He said that the Post Office Department will investigate to determine if Mrs. Lyle was doing political work or was merely engaged in work that relieved others in MORRISON'S office so they could engage in political work.

Representative H. E. Gross (Rep., Ia.) declared that in his view it would be improper for the executive branch to loan secretaries to the Congress for any purpose where it would "directly or indirectly represent a political assistance."

"The law was designed to prevent this type of thing, and it makes no difference whether the individual employee was involved directly or indirectly in the campaign activities," Gross said. "If we would excuse such activity where the employee is said to replace another employee who has gone off campaigning, then we would be providing a big loophole for the worst abuses possible."

Gross said such a loophole would make it possible to use all of the secretaries "a manpower pool for pure political maneuvering."

He said that the Post Office action in loaning secretaries to Congress during an election campaign "is an arrogant disregard for the intent of the Hatch Act."

## CARRIAGE OF MILITARY CARGOES BY U.S.-FLAG VESSELS AT REDUCED RATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President I will fight long and hard to defeat a bill recently reported to the floor of the Senate which "would cost the taxpayer well over \$1 billion in excess shipping charges and badly hurt Great Lakes shipping."

I refer to S. 3297, which is No. 1485 on the calendar, a bill which would stifle Department of Defense attempts to introduce competition among American ocean shippers for military cargo.

This August the Department of Defense at long last began to require competitive bidding on military cargos. This was a dramatic shift from DOD'S previous policy of negotiating shipping rates with conferences representing American-flag shippers.

Mr. President, in this respect the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] had a great deal to do with persuading the Department of Defense to adopt this economic policy.

The conference-negotiated rate was always based upon the maximum the traffic could bear. Furthermore, it had to be high enough to make money for even the most inefficient shipper belonging to the conference.

Conference rates have traditionally discriminated against the Great Lakes ports. The shipping conferences are dominated by east and west coast shippers who make sure that the Lakes will get no business by maintaining artifi-

September 21, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22637

really believes that this administration, on the record, has the political courage to halt the Government handouts.

Mr. President, a reduction in Federal expenditures is the way to effectively curb inflation. When the Government spends more than it takes in in taxes, it issues bonds to make up the deficit. These are sold to central banks and the Federal Reserve System which treats these bonds as assets and thereafter issues loans to its member banks and increases the supply of money. It is precisely this greater supply of money than goods and services, produced and offered for sale, which creates a competition for their purchase and drives the price of products up and the value of the dollar down.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that while the administration brags about the prosperity this Nation has experienced since 1960 that the national debt has increased 11 percent or \$31.6 billion, that the supply of money—that is the cash and bank deposits—have increased in the amount of \$214 from 1960, from \$109 billion in 1960 to \$323 billion in 1966.

It has been the administration's theory, under its adherence to the "new economics," that gradual inflation was not only good, but necessary to keep pace with our national growth. If this theory be true, it is no longer applicable, for the guidelines have broken down from the 3.2 percent which was deemed permissible for increases; prices and wages have long since been torn apart. They stand almost helpless before economic pressures which were created, but not controlled, by this administration.

Mr. President, those who saved, those who purchased bonds, created savings accounts, purchased savings and loan shares, paid premiums on insurance policies, those who live on pensions, those who live on fixed incomes and the poor—are those who severely suffer. What a paradox it is that the administration attempts to pick the poor up with one hand through an antipoverty spending program and pushes the poor down with the other hand because of its inflationary fiscal policies.

Mr. President, is there anyone who gains through inflation? Not in the long run. But those individuals and corporations who are mortgaged to the hilt—the total debt both public and private now being 1.3 trillion—have some short term advantages. Their thin equities increase in value and when their debts are paid it is done with depreciated dollars. But no one gains over the long run.

Mr. President, the administration is continually calling upon the American people for understanding, for sacrifice, and above all, for discipline. It is now time that the American people call upon its Government for understanding, for sacrifice and for discipline in fiscal matters.

#### MOBILE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is my pleasure today to call to the attention of all Americans, one of the finest volunteer service organizations in the United States. I am referring to the

Mobile Junior Chamber of Commerce, a group of approximately 500 young men who are responsible for projects which have gained worldwide recognition.

The Mobile Jaycees are the epitome of young, aggressive American men who serve their neighbors through their jobs and with their volunteer community service work. The organization sponsors nearly 100 different projects during the year ranging all the way from the internationally recognized orphans Christmas shopping tour, to many local projects of interest primarily to Mobilians.

The orphans Christmas shopping tour is an example of the energy, dedication and scope of service of the Mobile Jaycees. Several years ago, it occurred to a member of the Jaycees that many organizations remember orphans at Christmas with gifts, programs and entertainment. But the joy which most of us experience each Christmas as we shop for gifts for our families and loved ones was missing for the orphans and underprivileged.

So, Mobile Jaycees launched a community wide campaign to raise funds for one of the most unique projects in America, a Christmas shopping tour for the orphan and underprivileged. Each child is given \$5 with which to buy gifts. Jaycees conduct them on a daylong shopping venture and when the gifts have been selected, wives of Jaycees serve refreshments and help the youngsters gift wrap presents. This heartwarming project has become an international project of Jaycees all over the world and this Christmas, Jaycees in Europe, Asia, and South America will carry out this project in their communities.

Mobile Jaycees sponsor the nationally recognized America's Junior Miss Pageant which millions of Americans viewed on national color television last spring. Several thousand local pageants are conducted to select the outstanding young high school senior from each State. These Junior Misses are the weeklong guests of Mobile Jaycees during pageant week. Families, school friends and other visitors flock to Mobile for the colorful ceremonies which charm the entire city during the height of the Azalea Trail.

The Mobile Azalea Trail is another nationally recognized project of the Mobile Jaycees. More than 30 years ago, Mobile Jaycees first began an automobile tour of the city's most beautiful private and public gardens each spring during the height of the azalea season. Often flowers reach their peak during the colorful Mardi Gras for an unusually festive season.

Each year, several hundred thousand visitors stop in Mobile to view the flowers which Dorothy Dix has compared to the cherry blossom time in Japan.

Next month approximately 130,000 people from the Gulf Coast area will attend the Jaycee-sponsored Greater Gulf State Fair—one of the largest community fairs in the Southeast. Jaycees offer free booth space to community, civic, charitable, and educational groups and put in thousands of hours of volunteer work to make the fair an eagerly awaited fall event.

One of the oldest and most colorful Jaycee projects is the Alabama deep-sea fishing rodeo held each summer at nearby Dauphin Island. Internationally recognized sportsman Roy Martin of Panama City, Fla., is judge for the 3-day fishing contest in the Gulf of Mexico and nearby bay waters. The rodeo also sponsors monthly fishing contests and a 1-day contest for children which attracts more than 1,000 boys and girls.

Mobile Jaycees activities in international relations have earned national awards for the chapter which has adopted the entire country of Guatemala as a sister nation. Mobile Jaycees have spearheaded projects which have sent a registered thoroughbred bull for upgrading beef stock, medical supplies and equipment, a bookmobile, and funds for a new school building to Guatemala from Mobile citizens.

The Mobile Jaycees stress development of youth and many youth activities such as the soap box derby, track and field competitions, tennis and golf tournaments.

Earlier this year, a member of the Mobile Jaycees was named as one of the 10 outstanding young men of America. Dr. Frederick P. Whiddon, president of the University of South Alabama, has distinguished himself as a brilliant young educator in helping to found the first major public institution of higher learning in Alabama in 70 years. The Mobile Jaycees have been active in the cultural development of their city and have sponsored such projects as an art auction and art shows. Active in the area of historic preservation and redevelopment, the Jaycees have their permanent headquarters in a century old historic building in Mobile which they restored and which is now a major attraction of the city. A tourist information center is operating in the building.

It would take many pages to record all the accomplishments of the Mobile Jaycees—one of the truly fine organizations of America and one that every citizen whether from Alabama or another of our great States can be proud.

#### VIETNAM—THE EMERGING PICTURE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last night the Evening Star published an editorial, as well as an interpretive report by Crosby S. Noyes, which, taken together, draw accumulating facts and evidence into one somewhat brighter picture with regard to Vietnam. It is, as the Star's editorial called it, the emerging picture that something hopeful may be brewing in Vietnam at this point in time, coincidental with the opening of the new United Nations General Assembly. Mr. Noyes debunks U Thant's thesis that Vietnam has become a kind of holy war—at least from the Washington perspective or from that of Vietnam. But he, too, sees glimmers of hope developing from the recent occurrences, including U Thant's own sudden decision to stay on in his vital position at least a little longer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both the editorial and the report by Mr. Noyes be printed in the RECORD.

22638

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 21, 1966

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 20, 1966]

## THE EMERGING PICTURE

There is an accumulating weight of evidence that something hopeful may be brewing in Viet Nam.

There is the Pope's statement that he will take any steps necessary to halt the fighting in Southeast Asia, and the Papal Encyclical asking world-wide prayers for peace and a meeting to work out plans to end the war. There is United Nations Secretary General U Thant's plea for restraint and understanding on both sides and for consideration of the suffering of the people of Viet Nam. There is the revelation by Philippines President Marcos that the new leadership in Indonesia, which maintains diplomatic relations with both Saigon and Hanoi, is working for a settlement. There is Ambassador Goldberg's statement that the United States will continue to try to involve the United Nations "in bringing about a solution of the Vietnamese conflict" and his broad hint that a direct approach will be made to the Soviet Union to help bring the war to "a negotiated and honorable settlement." And there is Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko's assertion, on arrival for the opening of the General Assembly meeting, that the Soviet delegation "intends to help in the struggle for peace."

It would be easy enough to dismiss these isolated examples as empty repetitions of meaningless slogans. Even Russian verbal commitments to the cause of peace are, after all, nothing new. The only discernible difference between Gromyko's arrival message and the previous self-serving statements from the Kremlin is that in the past, lip-service to the cause of peace was accompanied by a free-swinging denunciation of the U.S. presence in Southeast Asia. There was before always the bland statement that the whole problem could be easily solved if only the warmongering Americans would go away and let the North Vietnamese settle South Viet Nam's problems. But this time, for a change, there was no demand for a unilateral withdrawal of U.S. force.

Is it merely wishful thinking to trace the dawn of hope in such pale, uncertain glimmers of light? Perhaps so. But perhaps, too, fitting all the isolated bits of evidence together, there is justification for the belief that the world community—including the free world, the noncommitted nations and the Communist bloc—has come to the conclusion that the American forces will never be driven out; will not pull out until peace is achieved, and will continue to escalate the war effort to whatever degree is necessary to counter the Communist thrust.

If this realization has indeed arrived, it will be time for Hanoi to join the search for a peaceful solution to the agony of Southeast Asia.

## UNITED STATES NOT WAGING A "HOLY WAR" IN VIET NAM

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

United Nations Secretary General U Thant had a bad word for just about everyone in his doleful report on the state of the world to the new U.N. General Assembly. But his reproaches presumably addressed to the United States over the conflict in Viet Nam were, in fact, not reproaches at all.

What particularly distresses the secretary general is the idea that negotiations to end the conflict in Viet Nam are being blocked by considerations of great power politics and that the conflict has become "a kind of holy war between two powerful ideologies."

"I remain convinced," U Thant wrote, "that the basic problem in Viet Nam is not one of ideology, but one of national identity and survival."

It may come as a surprise to U Thant, but there is no responsible official in Washington who would disagree with this sentiment. When it comes to the problem of explaining and justifying what the United States is trying to do in Viet Nam, President Johnson himself might well use the same words.

It is precisely to ensure the national identity and survival of South Viet Nam that the United States is fighting. In Viet Nam itself, it is the claim of South Viet Nam to national identity, rather than any unreconcilable ideological differences with the regime in Hanoi, that is the root of the conflict.

This claim to separate national identity has been sustained by the South Vietnamese for more than six years of intensifying struggle to avoid armed conquest by the north. It has been reaffirmed most recently by a vote in which more than 80 percent of the country's registered voters defied Hanoi and the Viet Cong to cast ballots for a representative constituent assembly.

Without American help, no doubt, the issue would have been settled long since by force. But whatever U Thant may think, the growing American involvement in Viet Nam has not given the conflict the character of a holy war, either in Saigon or in Washington.

So far as the statements of American leaders are concerned, there has been nothing to sustain the charge that the war is locked on primarily as an ideological confrontation. When Johnson, Rusk, and company speak of the necessity of containing Communist aggression in Southeast Asia, the operative word is "aggression."

From the very beginning the U.S. government has justified its effort purely and simply on the principle of self-determination—the right of the people of Viet Nam to decide their own destiny. The phrase "Communist aggression" is little more than a convenient shorthand for identifying the source of the aggression, whether it is applied to Hanoi or Peking. And the notion of a global ideological Armageddon has been studiously resisted by all responsible American spokesmen.

From the American point of view, the ideological character of the struggle is very largely irrelevant. It is not the fact that China and North Viet Nam are Communist nations that matters. What does matter is that they seek to impose their domination and their system on people who do not want them.

The Communists have, to be sure, made a considerable effort to turn the struggle in Viet Nam into a holy war. The Chinese, in particular, have made no bones about linking the outcome of that struggle to their doctrine of the ultimate universal triumph of militant communism.

The North Vietnamese, while subscribing, of course, to Chinese theories about "wars of national liberation," are somewhat more restrained in their theology and more inclined to view the war in terms of their own national aspirations. American experts believe that even China's ideological trumpets on Viet Nam are largely window-dressing to cover up what are in reality China's traditional national ambitions in Asia.

Perhaps the most convincing evidence against U Thant's holy war thesis is the persistent effort that the United States has been making to enlist the aid of the Soviet Union in getting peacetalks started.

It is, to say the least, an odd way to run a crusade. And recent developments in New York—including U Thant's own sudden decision to stay around for a while longer—offer at least a glimmer of hope that the way to a settlement may not be as hopelessly blocked as the secretary general has thought.

## INFLATION CURBS RECOMMENDED BY UNITED AUTOWORKERS INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the international executive board of the United Auto Workers—understandably concerned about inflation—has made a number of recommendations to curb it.

The board, for example, strongly supports the administration proposal to suspend the 7 percent investment tax credit.

But I am happy to note that the UAW agrees with me that the inflation threat should not be used as a club to kill or cripple our programs in education, health, and the war on poverty.

I feel certain that each Senator has already received a copy of the statement, but for other readers of the RECORD I ask unanimous consent that the report of the UAW board be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

## STATEMENT BY THE UAW INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD ON INFLATION

Cost-of-living wage adjustments under UAW contracts afford most UAW members a substantial degree of protection against erosion of their buying power by inflation. Nevertheless, UAW members and their families are deeply concerned with rising living costs.

To minimize the danger of further price increases, the UAW International Executive Board calls upon the Congress and the Administration to:

(1) Spotlight for the information of the public the facts as to important cases of corporate price-profiteering in order to create a climate of public opinion which would persuade corporations both to refrain from increasing prices unjustifiably and to reduce existing prices which are excessive. The automotive corporations should be among the first targets for such action.

(2) Reduce present extortionate interest rates through legislation which would set a ceiling on interest rates on all time deposits.

(3) Curb the dangerous investment boom that is unbalancing the economy by suspending both the 7 percent investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation on commercial and industrial construction and by increasing the tax rate on corporate profits.

(4) Press on toward full employment by diverting the resources now going into excessive investment, and by making use of other resources that still remain idle, to step up the war on poverty and to meet urgent national needs in such fields as education, health, housing and renewal of our cities.

Inflation inflicts serious hardships on pensioners and others with low and fixed incomes. It penalizes the unemployed, the poor and the nation as a whole because it inhibits government action to reduce unemployment, to intensify the war on poverty and to improve the quality of life in America.

Moreover, misguided efforts to prevent inflation threaten to slow economic growth, thus increasing unemployment, and even to plunge the nation into recession. High interest rates and tight money, touted as anti-inflationary weapons, have already created a depression in the housing industry and have contributed to the decline in sales of automobiles.

It is important that the causes of recent rapid increases in prices be clearly understood so that effective policies may be applied to prevent further increases.

The nation is suffering primarily from a

September 21, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22639

profit and interest inflation. This is indisputably clear from the following facts:

Unit labor costs in manufacturing—the cost of wages, salaries, fringe benefits, and employment taxes involved in making the average manufactured product—are now lower than in the years 1957–59, and in July of 1966 were only 0.1 percent higher than in July 1965. There would actually have been a decrease if not for the rise in social security taxes at the beginning of this year. In other words, all the gains in wages, salaries and fringe benefits made by workers since 1957–59 have been more than paid for by their increased productivity. The value of the additional goods and services that advancing technology enables workers to produce is greater than the cost of their gains.

Although unit labor costs were lower than the 1957–59 level, wholesale prices of manufactured goods were 6.0 percent higher in July than they were in the 1957–59 period. With the period 1957–59 as 100, the ratio of wholesale prices to unit labor costs in manufacturing industry was 106.9 in July 1966—the highest level reached since the speculative inflation set off by the Korean war. Manufacturing corporations have raised and are continuing to raise their prices even though their labor costs have been falling. Prices have been raised not to meet higher costs but to increase profits.

While labor costs per unit of goods produced in manufacturing have fallen, profits of manufacturing corporations per unit increased 19.5 percent before taxes and 28.3 percent after taxes in 1966 as compared to the 1957–59 period—and the rise in profits has continued into 1966.

From the second quarter of 1960—the peak period of economic activity before the last recession—to the second quarter of this year, a great gap has been developing between income from work and income from property. Wages, salaries and fringe benefits of all employees in the private economy rose 41.7 percent, while corporation profits rose 60.0 percent before taxes and 75.2 percent after taxes, dividends rose 56.3 percent, and interest income going to individuals [most of it to wealthy individuals] rose 81.5 percent.

Ever since 1956, REIA employee compensation per manhour [the buying power of wages, salaries and fringe benefits for the average hour worked] in the total private economy has been lagging behind productivity [the value of goods and services produced per manhour]. The increase in real employee compensation per hour from 1956 to 1965 was 24.5 percent compared to a 34.4 percent increase in productivity. Workers, in other words, have not gotten their share of the fruits of their increased productivity. The benefits of rising productivity have instead gone disproportionately to corporations in higher profits and to stockholders in increased dividends.

The buying power of the average blue collar factory worker's weekly wage, after taxes, was actually lower in July 1966 than in the same month last year. In dollars of 1957–59 buying power, the figures are \$87.00 for July 1966 compared to \$87.42 in July 1965, a decrease of \$0.42 per week, for a worker with three dependents.

Soaring profits and lagging buying power of wage and salary earners have created an imbalance that threatens the stability of the economy. Inflated profits have led to an unhealthy and unsustainable investment boom. After adjustment for price increases, investment for purposes other than housing increased at an average rate of 12.3 percent a year during the two years ending June 30, 1966, while the growth of the whole economy, as reflected in gross national product, was at the rate of 5.5 percent—and the pace of investment is still accelerating. When the new investment comes fully into operation,

it will confront a shortage of customers if steps are not taken in time to raise the buying power of workers and other consumers by raising wages and reducing prices. A similar imbalance between booming investment and lagging consumer incomes led to the 1957–58 recession.

Rising interest rates have also siphoned off part of the gains from increased worker productivity and, in addition, have added to living costs. From July 1965 to July 1966, the average interest rate on FHA new home mortgages increased from 5.44 to 6.45 percent—a rise of 18.6 percent. This adds \$2700 to the interest cost of a \$15,000 mortgage payable over 25 years. Prime interest rates charged by the banks to their most favored customers have risen 33½ percent in nine months. The prime rate affects other rates, increasing the interest cost of installment purchases as well as other forms of consumer credit. High interest rates and tight money also make it difficult for state and local governments and boards of education to finance needed expansion of public facilities. In addition, high interest rates raise production costs compelling competitive industries with thin profit margins to raise their prices, thus giving the inflationary spiral another twist.

It is true, of course, that the rise in food prices has been mainly due to scarcities of some items and that costs of some services have increased for reasons peculiar to the service industries. But increased prices for foods and services could and should have been offset by reductions in prices charged by manufacturing corporations whose profits have been rising phenomenally.

An effective attack on inflation must be mounted on several fronts.

The government must mobilize all the resources at its disposal to expose the facts about price-profiteering so that an informed and aroused public opinion will persuade corporations to reduce excessive prices. Among the leading targets for vigorous efforts to reduce prices are the automotive corporations. Despite some decrease in sales, the auto industry big three, combined, reported profits on stockholders investment during the first half of 1966 equal to 27.2 percent per year compared to an annual rate of 13.3 percent for all manufacturing corporations during the first quarter of this year (the latest period for which figures are available). The big three's profit rates, in other words, are more than twice as high as the average for all manufacturing corporations at a time when that average is far above normal. The profits of the big three in 1965 totalled \$5,846 million before taxes. After taxes, their profits were \$3,062 million, or \$608 million higher than in any previous year. For every wage and salaried worker employed in all its operations throughout the world, Chrysler reported a before-tax profit of \$2,689 per employee; Ford, \$3,581 per employee; and General Motors a staggering \$5,570 per employee. Despite these incredible profits, which clearly call for reductions in prices, the automotive corporations are hinting instead that they will raise them, using the installation of certain safety equipment as their excuse. This would be in direct conflict with the hope expressed by President Johnson that the auto industry "build in more safety—without building on more costs." The UAW International Executive Board urges that a Congressional investigation be undertaken immediately in an effort not only to head off unjustifiable increases in car prices but to bring them down to a level reasonably in line with the costs of car production.

The lopsided investment boom that endangers the future stability of the economy must be brought to a halt. The UAW International Executive Board therefore supports President Johnson's recommendation to sus-

pend the investment credit and accelerated depreciation. The 7 percent investment tax credit, enacted to encourage investment in machinery and equipment, has no place in an economy where investment is running at clearly excessive levels. Neither is there any place for accelerated depreciation designed to encourage industrial and commercial construction.

Funds being used to finance the exaggerated investment boom should be made less easily available by increasing the tax rate on corporate profits. At the very least, it should be restored to the 52 percent level in effect before the tax reductions of 1964.

At the same time, we must not relax either in our pursuit of full employment or in our efforts to meet urgent national needs. Curbing the investment boom will free resources in men, machines and materials that can be diverted to other purposes. There are additional resources that remain idle even after 5½ years of recovery from the last recession. These resources can and should be used to accelerate and intensify the war on poverty, and to help fill social deficits in such fields as education, health care and facilities, housing and urban redevelopment. So long as there are still men idle and national needs unmet we must spare no effort to employ the men to meet the needs.

Action must be taken to reduce interest rates. As a first step in this direction, the UAW International Executive Board urges the Senate to reject the meaningless bill adopted by the House on September 8 and substitute legislation that will impose a 4½ percent interest rate ceiling on all time deposits.

The rising price trend must be halted. But we must not repeat the tragic mistakes of the Eisenhower years when restrictions on government spending and tight money finally brought price stability at the cost of high unemployment, retarded economic growth and repeated recessions. The victims of such misdirected economic policies are inevitably the poorest and most vulnerable of the nation's population—members of minority groups, displaced older workers, and those with limited education. A rise of a mere two-tenths of a percentage point in the general unemployment rate—from 3.7 percent in April of this year to 3.9 percent in August—was accompanied by increases six times as great in unemployment rates for Negroes and unskilled blue collar workers. To combat inflation with unemployment is to surrender in the war against poverty and to abandon the struggle for genuine equality for all Americans.

The attack on inflation must be directed at its sources—corporate price-profiteering, tight money and usurious interest rates, and the investment boom. At the same time, we must press on toward genuine full employment, in fulfillment of the national commitment proclaimed in the Employment Act of 1946.

#### THE NEED TO HELP LATIN AMERICA SOLVE ITS MOST PRESSING PROBLEM

Mr. GRUENING. Little more than 14 months ago, one of the most distinguished men of the Americas, Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, former president of Colombia and today chairman of Vision, Latin America's largest news magazine, came to Washington, D.C., to testify at the population crisis hearings. Dr. Lleras was no novice when it came to discussing the population problems of Latin America. He had written about them in Vision, observing on May 29, 1964:

If Latin America does not attain a fabulous, and until now unforeseeable, economic development, its population growth inexorably must convert it into one of the most destitute, miserable, and devastated regions on earth . . . .

We are having plenty of trouble even now trying to develop our countries with our present population level, and the figures showing current economic growth virtually melt away when they are divided by population growth. This being the case, the steadily rising deficiencies in employment, housing, and other essential needs (such as pure water systems and public health facilities) will create a crisis of unimaginable proportions 36 years hence.

On July 9, 1965, Dr. Lleras spoke more strongly at the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures hearing on S. 1676, my bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request at home and abroad.

He discussed "a new and terrible kind of leprosy—the slum," which he pointed out had begun to disfigure the once comfortable and lovely urban centers, and added:

For a long time leaders of the backward countries failed to see that the population problem was the source of most of the evils they were trying to wipe out, and of the stagnation in their nation's development.

Unemployment, he said, was mushrooming at a fantastic rate in Latin America.

The population crisis in Latin America—

He said—

is caused by the speed at which Latin America's population has been growing. At the current rate, it is beyond manageable proportions, and certainly beyond the capacities of the Latin Americans to cope with it. Latin America is breeding misery, revolutionary pressures, famine and many other potentially disastrous problems in proportions that exceed our imagination even in the age of thermonuclear war.

In view of the calm yet grim observations which have been made by Dr. Lleras, an individual not given to exaggeration, the news story appearing in the New York Times this morning, headlined "Population Pressures Spurring Latin Birth Control Advances," is both hopeful and distressing. Reporter Juan de Onis reports on the first Brazilian National Family Welfare Conference held in Recife last week, attended by more than 200 physicians, social workers, priests, economists and international representatives.

Recife, a town of 350,000 in 1940, has a population exceeding 1 million today.

Economist Glycon de Paiva, present at the conference, is reported as follows:

We are 85 million Brazilians now, and we will be 100 million in 1970. Unless present trends are slowed down, we will be 225 million pariahs at the end of the century. There is no economic formula for maintaining living standards under these circumstances. We must avoid the disaster.

Dr. Rodriguez Lima, director of the maternity school of the faculty of medicine of the University of Rio de Janeiro, who organized the conference, and the National Family Welfare Foundation, released the findings of his survey conducted by the foundation among 2,900 men and women in seven cities, covering

all social classes and income levels, which found that 91 percent of the persons interviewed were in favor of an educational campaign on contraception. Dr. Rodriguez and his fellow doctors estimate there were 1.2 million induced abortions a year in Brazil.

The pioneer work in Chile in population control includes the training of doctors from all over Latin America, according to reporter de Onis.

Mrs. Ofelia Mendoza, technical director for Latin America of the International Planned Parenthood Federation of London, told those present in Recife:

The people are ready \* \* \*. They want help. It takes leaders in this field to break the taboos.

Said Dr. Walter Rodriguez, secretary of the Brazilian National Family Welfare Conference:

To make a real dent in the population growth rate, we will have to reach some 10 million women. This will involve millions of dollars a year in specialized centers and clinics. It is a staggering effort.

Dr. Rodriguez is correct. It will require a staggering effort, and we cannot expect Brazil to do the job alone.

The United States must make certain that other nations know that we stand ready to help them meet the multiplying problems of their multiplying populations. Certainly President Johnson has been positive in his directives. Now is the time for our Department of State, our Agency for International Development, and our Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to help, not tomorrow.

Congress has approved amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act which make it absolutely clear that counterpart funds and dollars can be used to provide family planning helps in other nations.

We need not evade the challenge which must be solved if mankind is to prosper. To do so is to turn our backs on men and women who given the opportunity will solve their population explosions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the New York Times article by Juan de Onis be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

POPULATION PRESSURES SPURRING LATIN BIRTH CONTROL ADVANCES  
(By Juan de Onis)

RECIFE, BRAZIL, September 19.—Birth-control programs are developing in Latin America in response to growing public awareness of population problems.

Significant family planning efforts led by respected medical men are under way in countries with critically high birth rates. The movement is spreading with a speed that is encouraging to international experts in the population field.

The first Brazilian National Family Welfare Conference was held last week in Recife, where the gap between population growth and economic production is dramatically apparent.

As more than 200 physicians, social workers, priests, economists and international representatives met here, newspapers announced that Recife this week had become Brazil's fourth largest city with a population of more than a million. In 1940, the population was 350,000.

Recife's growth is the result of a booming birth rate and an influx from rural areas, where population increases are outstripping agricultural employment.

UNEMPLOYMENT HIGH

More than half the people in this city live in slums, where illiteracy rates exceed 50 per cent. The minimum wage for the area is \$30 a month. Unemployment among unskilled workers is high. Many children survive by begging or digging for food in garbage cans.

Glycon de Paiva, an economist specializing in population problems, said:

"We are 85 million Brazilians now, and we will be 100 million in 1970. Unless present trends are slowed down, we will be 225 million pariahs at the end of the century. There is no economic formula for maintaining living standards under these circumstances. We must avoid the disaster."

Recent months have produced the first effective response to Brazil's population growth rate of 3.5 per cent a year. The National Family Welfare Foundation has been organized under the leadership of Dr. Otavio Rodriguez Lima.

Dr. Rodriguez Lima, 66 years old, is director of the maternity school of the faculty of medicine of the University of Rio de Janeiro, where he has instructed two generations of Brazilian gynecologists and obstetricians. He is a practicing Roman Catholic with social prestige and shrewd political judgment.

FAMILY WELFARE SOCIETIES

Under his leadership, family welfare societies have been set up in a score of Brazilian cities, and the movement is growing. The societies are formed by physicians, usually in connection with local faculties of medicine. There is no direct governmental involvement.

A survey conducted by the Foundation among 2,900 men and women in seven cities, covering all social classes and income levels, reported that 91 per cent of the persons interviewed were in favor of an educational campaign on contraception.

This survey followed a medical statistical study on abortion, organized by Dr. Rodriguez Lima with the cooperation of doctors throughout the country, that estimated that there were 1.2 million induced abortions a year in Brazil.

This widely publicized study, which asserted that 60 per cent of the budgets of maternity hospital services were consumed in treating abortion patients, jarred the public as well as physicians.

About 200,000 Brazilian women are using pills that regulate ovulation, representing annual sales of \$3-million.

SURVEY ON CONTRACEPTION

The survey indicated that 90 per cent of married women consulted were using, or had used, some form of contraception or had practiced abortion—in some cases as many as eight times.

"Refusal today to consider the need of women, according to their consciences, of avoiding pregnancy goes against the agonizing reality of the individual and social problem of abortion in Brazil," said Dr. Rodriguez Lima.

A similar situation exists in Colombia, where 220,000 prescriptions for birth-control pills are filled every month. That number represents about 5 per cent of the women of childbearing age in the country and is above the number of women in the upper income categories.

Dr. Fernando Tamayo, a prominent Bogotá obstetrician, has begun a family planning program that has opened three centers in Colombia's capital and has provided intrauterine devices to 1,500 women, mostly from poor neighborhoods. New centers are being opened in other Colombian cities. Dr. Tamayo said he hoped the program would treat 30,000 to 50,000 women by 1967.

"The lake has a great future," he says. "But we are interested now in building tourist trade this summer to the fullest extent. We are leaving out nothing this year to attract popular support. The reactivation of the old Saltair trains are a big help."

Those who remember the crowded trains that used to leave Salt Lake City almost hourly during the swimming season will agree.

Members of the Pro-Utah Travel Industry Committee, established by the legislature to stimulate the tourist industry, welcome these bids for tourists. Chairman Wayne M. Winegar says "Conditions are more ideal than ever before for multi-resort operations on the lake." D. James Cannon, Pro-Utah director, points out that in addition to the projects already mentioned, the new park at the north end of Antelope Island, proposed by the GSLA, could add much to the amount of beach available in the near future.

Meanwhile, a struggle goes on between two conflicting philosophies. There are those who still insist the lake is a natural monster, wild and untamable. GSLA scientists and planners disagree. Slowly, however, the two camps seem to be drawing closer together.

The problems of controlling the lake are far more complex than the average layman understands, and this complexity is one reason for divergence in opinion even among the experts.

According to the late Dr. Thomas C. Adams, formerly an engineering professor at the University of Utah, and other lake scientists, the normal rate of evaporation in Utah is 59 inches per annum for fresh water, while water at maximum salt density loses less than 39 inches. Naturally, all mixtures in between will evaporate more slowly as the salt increases and more rapidly as the salt decreases.

Practically all drainage water enters Great Salt Lake along the southeast shore, reaching its highest point in the spring and early summer. Most of it is runoff from the Jordan, Weber, and Bear rivers. The fresh water, being lighter, fans out over the salt water in large areas, slowly becoming mixed with the salt water with the help of the winds and the waves until late in the summer the entire mass approaches a uniform density. Until then, the rate of evaporation varies as the water varies in salt content, giving the surface a tendency to stand at different levels, except as it flattens itself out by gravity.

In 1959, a startling new factor was injected when the Southern Pacific Railroad completed its new solid fill across the lake and abandoned the old trestle work on which its tracks had been mounted for many years. This man-made barrier interferes with the natural movements of the water, forcing large quantities of the fresh water from the rivers to move out along the south side of the fill, where it slowly seeps through the porous rock formation to the north and becomes trapped. Waves involved in the natural mixing process batter themselves to pieces against the rocks of the fill.

#### A LEAK TO THE NORTH

The barrier is not completely waterproof. Since the north end of the lake, having no large inlets and sustained primarily by precipitation, evaporates three times as much water as it receives, it is constantly sucking water from the south end to maintain its level. It traps more than its share of the fresh water, speeds up its own rate of evaporation, and increases the migration of salt to the north. So the entire lake is dumping excessive amounts of salt to the north, causing the water of the south portions to lose its density gradually, increasing its rate of evaporation—a vicious cycle.

At the present rate, it is estimated that the salt content of the lake will be reduced

to 50 per cent of maximum salinity in 14 years. Dean Eardley estimates that the south half of the lake can be maintained at the 4,200-foot level (practically ideal for all purposes) with about half of the fresh water inflow of the past several years, and also by keeping the density up to maximum salinity by cutting off the salt leak with a solid dike. These steps could result in a tremendous check in the evaporation loss. The surplus fresh water could be used for home, industrial and agricultural purposes in the fresh water areas, or diverted back to the north end if needed to meet the requirements of future industrialization.

Perhaps one of the lake's worst handicaps has been its inaccessibility. Of its approximately 200 miles of shoreline only about three miles in the extreme southeast corner has ever been put to recreational use. The rest is a vast wasteland made worse by the wide fluctuations of the water level. Because of the lake basin's shallowness, water flows back and forth across several hundred square miles, creating the widely publicized controversy over the ownership of the shorelands.

Once this central island system of roads and dikes is completed, however, the islands themselves will add many miles of beaches and approaches. Even the dikes between may eventually be supplemented by man-made beaches. There will be almost unlimited facilities for motels, golf courses, and new recreation areas of every description.

These possibilities will bring added competition, a fact which may be of concern to owners of the small south end resort properties. Their worry appears to be needless, because the increasing use of the lake for recreational purposes will probably keep ahead of construction of facilities.

Admittedly, the cost of the master plan will be gigantic. Nevertheless, for the first time in history, it appears the natural resources of the lake could pay back the cost.

According to A. Z. Richards, Jr., consulting engineer to the GSLA, the fresh water reservoir in the east embayment would supply industry, agriculture and recreation uses on a profitable basis. By placing a dike along the east zone, large areas of the old lake bed, now a useless swamp, would be exposed. Production of valuable chemicals from this soil would be speeded up.

#### THE LAKE WOULD PAY ITS DEBTS

Roads, parks, bathing beaches, and all housing and recreational facilities connected with Antelope and Fremont islands would become immediately profitable.

Based on the master plan computations, the state would have to borrow \$1 million a year for 12 years, possibly by issuing bonds. Private interests will need to raise another \$1 million annually during the same period. It is estimated that after a period of 15 years the sale of dependable water and reclaimed land would begin to repay to the state the millions invested.

Private investors would get their money back sooner by exploiting the industrial and recreational opportunities. The first six years would see the east dike and embayment completed; the second six-year period would complete the dike across the lake and around to the point of beginning.

The key to this overall plan, which will determine the rate at which it can go forward, is the present experiment the GSLA is conducting with the cooperation of Kennecott Copper Co. to determine if the tailings from the mills at Magna can be used to build the proposed dike system. A test strip is being run into the lake, and though only partially completed, the results are highly favorable. Richards is enthusiastic.

"The fears of the opponents of the plan," he says, "are not being justified. The tailings, which are being run directly from the mills to the lake by a flotation system, firm up and make a solid core in the salt water,

and not even the strongest waves tear them apart.

"Neither do the tailings cause the water to be murky as some feared. This is because the material is entirely rock and mineral particles. Though a small amount of colloidal material remains loose at the outer edges, it merely flows back and forth with the movements of the waves, without changing the basic formation or contaminating the water."

The experiment, now well under way, will be continued several thousand feet further into the lake, then will be permitted to stand while it is studied.

Utah State University will try to determine what plant life might be induced to grow along such a dike system.

Since the entire experimental dike, extending more than 50 miles, can be accomplished by direct flotation from the mills with the help of booster pumps, it would cost only a fraction of any other known dike construction method.

Another big hurdle was overcome early in June when President Johnson signed into law a bill introduced by Sen. FRANK E. MOSS, D-Utah, and Rep. DAVID S. KING, D-Utah, directing the federal government to sell to Utah a strip of land encircling the lake lying between the early-day federal government survey of the lake boundary and the present, receded lake shoreline. Sale price is subject to negotiation or court settlement.

Once settled, the process of issuing concessions for both industrial and recreational purposes can be speeded up. As many as 650,000 acres of shoreline land is involved.

#### WHO SHOULD CONTROL IT?

KING and MOSS have also introduced bills which would convert Antelope island into a national monument. There is considerable opposition to this bill in Utah, however. Many people feel the state should not lose control of the island. The Republicans in Congress, Sen. WALLACE F. BENNETT and Rep. LAURENCE J. BURTON, along with ex-Gov. Clyde, seem to favor state control.

Representative KING sums up the need for a broad design: "If the great resources of the lake are left to haphazard individual development, the result would be spotty, often inadequate, and without a true western motif. There is almost unlimited opportunity for individual enterprise in the large publicly-controlled plan."

Governor Rampton promises to push ahead as fast as possible on both the commercial and recreational development of the lake.

"This includes the development of Antelope island," he says. "I see no incompatibility between combining commercial and recreational uses. The lake and its resources are large enough for both, and Utah's economic growth requires that both commercial and recreational uses of the lake be developed to the maximum extent."

Based on the growing unanimity of purpose and resolve, coordinated by the master plan of the GSLA, the plan to rescue Great Salt Lake from its present pattern of disuse and decline is gaining momentum.

#### UN WHY THE JOY OVER VIET ELECTION?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President almost before the final ballot was cast in the recent South Vietnamese elections, and even before the results could be analyzed, administration spokesmen, news stories and editorial writers in many parts of the United States were hailing the election as a great triumph for democracy.

If herding a preselected populace to the polls to vote for carefully screened candidates is a victory for democracy

September 21, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22643

for some time. Mr. Poulsen discusses frankly some of the problems which must be solved before we can make the most of this great scenic attraction, and outlines plans for development under consideration by private enterprise, the State of Utah and the Federal Government.

Since the Congress has recently completed action on legislation which clears the way for industrial development of the lake, and since there is still pending before us my bill to establish a Great Salt Lake National Monument on Antelope Island in the lake, I am confident that the Poulsen article will be of interest to my colleagues as background. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article from the Denver Post be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

**NEW HOPE FOR AMERICA'S DEAD SEA—DIMINISHING WATERS HAVE CAST AN UGLY BLIGHT ON GREAT SALT LAKE—NOW, UTAHANS HAVE AMBITIOUS PLANS TO RESTORE IT FOR INDUSTRY AND RECREATION**

(By Ezra J. Poulsen)

Once-famous Saltair resort is a pile of disintegrating bones—a multi-million-dollar eyesore standing forlornly a half mile from the receding waters of Great Salt Lake.

These decaying buildings, about 15 miles west of Salt Lake City, tell the ordinary observer more graphically than anything else the story of what is happening to the famous "inland sea," one of North America's natural wonders.

The level of Great Salt Lake, always an uncertain factor because of seasonal and cyclic variations, has declined almost constantly for the past four decades. There was one sharp upturn in the early 1950s, but the lake level has never been adequate for satisfactory operation of Saltair since about 1930 by which time the waters had pulled away far enough to cause serious damage to the resort.

By the early 1960s, the lake was at its lowest level on record, large portions of its water polluted by refuse from cities along the west slope of the Wasatch mountains. It had come to be regarded by many as a hopeless cesspool, abandoned by both man and nature.

Now, however, there is hope of building back the lake. A master plan of great ambition, developed by a group of leading Utah political leaders, scientists and businessmen organized as the Great Salt Lake Authority (GSLA), has just come off the drawing boards.

Some exploratory and engineering work has started.

The outlay may eventually reach \$100 million. The time, as viewed by Gov. Calvin Rampton of Utah, could take up to 75 years. These estimates are on the far outer limits of the project, but there is much going for the immediate future. Many of the construction features can be completed within 10 years.

Inside this broad framework are many personal views. Private recreational and industrial interests are going ahead with their own programs. Scoffers say some of the plans are visionary, and tough old-timers declare that this particular piece of wilderness, which is as wild today as it was more than a century ago when the white man first made his appearance, will never be tamed. But things are happening, and slowly the GSLA is emerging as the unifying factor.

The awakening began in 1963 when the Utah legislature, with the support of George D. Clyde, then the governor, authorized the

GSLA and gave it \$200,000 to study the lake and its problems. The program, continued under Governor Rampton and granted another \$200,000 by the 1965 legislature, has gained the support of scientists, educators and the general public. As the complexities of the lake problem, the multiple interests surrounding it, and the divergent views are being resolved, the master plan is unfolding.

To understand what has been happening, one must be aware of two basic facts.

First, the rapidly growing population of more than a half million people west of the Wasatch range, which includes the largest cities and towns and the most fertile fields in the Great Basin, is constantly increasing the amount of water used in homes and by agriculture and industry. Hence, a large portion of the natural drainage of the lake never gets there—at least not on schedule. We might compare the human population with a herd of thirsty cattle drinking from a small, trickling stream. Soon, the water disappears into a mudhole, and you might well ask, where did it go?

The next thing to consider is the huge loss of lake water by evaporation. According to Dean A. J. Eardley, of the University of Utah College of Engineering, evaporation from the Great Salt Lake exceeds all the water used for agriculture, industry, and municipalities along the entire Wasatch front. The lake is somewhat like a teakettle of boiling water. If evaporation goes on faster than the kettle is refilled, it must become dry. There is no wonder that the level of the lake is low.

That's why Saltair, world famous in its heyday (1894 to 1900, and from 1907 to about 1928), is now stranded on a bed of sand despite years of desperate efforts to save it. It withers in a desert near the lake, and has been further defaced by years of vandalism.

Whether Saltair can be restored is problematical, but another delegation recently asked Gov. Rampton for a chance to try.

The GSLA, however, has the only broad solution to keep water at a uniform level necessary to sustain any resort. Backed by governmental powers and drawing in its wake an increasing number of other interests, it proposes to provide three lakes where there is now one.

#### DIKES WILL DIVIDE THE LAKE

The present 750,000-acre lake would be cut in half by constructing a dike. The north end would be left to the mercies of nature, at least for now. The south half would be encircled with a dike—broad enough to carry a highway—and other dikes would be developed from time to time.

This encircling dike would "cinch down" the lake so that its surface area would be reduced (cutting down the amount of evaporation). The lake would also be deepened by this constriction. Control gates would hold the lake at a level of 4,200 feet elevation. Present lake elevation is 4,195 feet, the highest since June 1, 1960.

A large body of fresh water would be created east of the southern portions of the present lake to trap some of the fresh water stream runoff that now empties into the lake. This would be a new body of water and would cover land that is now almost unusable as either barren soil or swampy mudholes.

This new lake basin would become a tremendously important recreational and industrial asset, particularly when developed in connection with the huge Willard reservoir (a part of the \$97.5 million Weber Basin Project) recently completed. Facilities are envisioned for all types of water sports.

Even though abandoned as part of the immediate water conservation project, the north end of the lake basin would become increasingly important industrially because

of its deposits of sodium chloride, magnesium, lithium and other minerals.

The entire complex of salt water, fresh water, dikes, roads and marshes challenges the imagination, stretching as it does over an area approximately 50 miles from east to west and 100 miles from north to south. Beginning 20 miles west of Salt Lake City, the area extends almost to the Idaho border.

Roads, some already modern, others being improved and still more scheduled for construction, would be integrated into a system of scenic highways leading to many points of interest.

One such example is the Golden Spike National Historic Site, established a year ago, where in 1869 a golden spike was driven to link the East and West with the first transcontinental railroad.

There are also five major islands within the scope of the project—Antelope, with a thriving herd of buffalo; Fremont, named for the soldier-explorer John C. Fremont; Bird, a bird rookery; Carrington and Stansbury. They would be connected by dikes.

Beyond the central salt water area, the network of roads would tie all parts of the basin with Wasatch basin cities and towns noted for their cultural, historical, and horticultural interests.

Other points of note would include the wildfowl refuge near Brigham City, and the famous Salt Flats west toward Wendover, where automobile speed records are made and broken.

Not all plans are for the distant future. One group of resort operators has worked hard this spring hoping to make 1966 the greatest tourist year in the lake's history.

John C. Silver, owner of Silver Sand's Beach at the south end of the lake—a resort that drew an estimated 100,000 visitors last year—says, "The public is getting tired of the way things have been going, and is demanding more and better facilities."

#### PLANS FOR A NEW BEACH

Silver also heads another company, The New Saltair, Inc. (no connection with the old Saltair), with plans to build a small island on a reef beyond the old Salt Lake County boat landing, now desolate because of the receding water.

"This islet," Silver says, "is designed so its beaches will be intact whether the water is high or low." The public would be transported to the island by boat. He believes it is out far enough to function at the lowest level of the water, and will be high enough and strong enough to resist the water at all conceivable levels.

There are two other beaches being used now: Sunset, adjoining Silver Sands, and Blackrock, the oldest and best known of the three. Blackrock, not a formally-operated beach, is free to the public, but has only a few concessions and weather-beaten bath-houses.

If the lake level should rise suddenly, beyond all expectations, these three beach areas would be flooded out. They offer excellent salt water bathing, but there is nothing to attract the tourist for more than a few hours. A drive of 15 to 25 minutes takes tourists to good hotels and motels.

Last summer and again this year an added feature is provided—the return for special runs of the old Salt Lake Garfield diesel-powered railroad trains which once carried vacationers by the thousands to Saltair. Silvers transports rail passengers from the old Saltair terminal to his beach by bus and boat.

#### SALT LAKE SEEKS TOURISTS

Maxwell E. Rich, former adjutant general of the Utah National Guard and now executive secretary of the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce, points out the strong determination of business leaders to make the most of what is now available.



then, I confess, I am at a loss to understand the true meaning of the word.

The keystone of any democracy is free elections. If a government prohibits from voting those who may not share its views—if a government prevents those people from running for election with whose opinions it disagrees—then it cannot be said that there has been a free election.

What happened in South Vietnam in this past election was akin to what has been happening over the years in the Soviet Union where only carefully selected candidates dedicated to the Communist regime are permitted to have their names on the ballot and then the government blatantly claimed to have held "free elections" and to have garnered 99<sup>4</sup>/<sub>100</sub> percent of the vote.

In a thoughtful article in the Washington Star for September 19, 1966, the eminent columnist Clayton Fritchey analyzes the elections in South Vietnam in realistic terms and presents a view which differs from the prevailing paeans. Mr. Fritchey says in part:

If the American people swallow the new Ky-Johnson line, they will again end up disappointed and disillusioned, just as they have in the past when the truth ultimately deflated previous propaganda fantasies.

It is better to face up to the truth at once, and the truth is that the Viet Nam election (if it can honestly be called that) is by no stretch of the imagination a testimonial to General Ky's military government.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fritchey's article in the Washington Star for September 19, 1966 entitled "Why the Joy Over Viet Election?" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

#### WHY THE JOY OVER VIET ELECTION?

(By Clayton Fritchey)

The post-election jag in South Viet Nam goes on unabated, and the intoxication of Washington officialdom almost equals that of the Saigon generals, who are described as "almost delirious with joy."

Premier Ky and the other leaders of the military dictatorship are hailing the election as a "triumph for democracy," a "smashing victory" for the government, and a testimonial to the ruling junta.

The President of the U.S. has added his own beaming benediction: "The large turnout," he said "is to me a vote of confidence." Confidence in what?

If the American people swallow the new Ky-Johnson line, they will again end up disappointed and disillusioned, just as they have in the past when the truth ultimately deflated previous propaganda fantasies.

It is better to face up to the truth at once and the truth is that the Viet Nam election (if it can honestly be called that) is by no stretch of the imagination a testimonial to Gen. Ky's military government.

No one yet knows what the election results really mean, or even portend, so Ky and his U.S. supporters simply proclaim that the mere size of the turnout (also in dispute) is in itself an endorsement of the government.

Yet the one, indisputable, fact seems to be that if the vote is a testimonial to anything at all, it is to the people's deep desire to have an elected, civilian government, and not a self-imposed military one, such as Ky presently heads up.

Just how that constitutes a ringing affirmation of the Ky junta is something that baffles disinterested observers, most of whom see the election as a strong expression of popular will for replacing the generals with a constitutional, representative government.

If that is so, why are the generals so elated? They are jubilant because they think they have succeeded (temporarily at least) in acquiring the protective coloring of a democratic election, without running any risks to their own future. They think they have fixed it so that they are safe no matter what happens. And they are probably right in this estimate.

As everyone knows, the only reason the elections were held in the first place is that the Buddhists forced Ky to call them. Last spring, it took weeks of demonstrations, violence, and fiery immolations to exact an electoral promise from the junta. The Buddhists have never been pro-Communist or pro-Viet Cong. They simply fought for elections and representative government until the militarists grudgingly gave in.

No doubt the hopes of many unsophisticated Vietnamese, especially in the provinces, have been momentarily raised by the joy of just casting a ballot; and no doubt many Americans would like to believe Premier Ky's statement that the election means "a brighter, more beautiful future" for his nation.

The only fly in this unctuous ointment is that in the little more than 10 years of South Viet Nam's history there have been a dozen military governments, and none of these regimes, including Ky's, has yet been able to find a place for the people in the country's "beautiful future."

#### MANAGING THE NORTHEAST CORRIDOR'S HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on June 16, 1965, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Commerce in support of S. 1588, the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965, I cited the Communications Satellite Corp., and suggested that serious consideration be given to the idea of chartering a mixed public-private corporation along the lines of Comsat to do the job of building and managing the new ground transportation systems that eventually will result from the research undertaken pursuant to the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965.

Subsequently, I asked the New Haven chapter of the Ripon Society, which is composed of Yale University students, to explore the feasibility of this idea. Let me add, parenthetically and by way of explanation, that the Ripon Society is a Republican research and policy organization whose members are young academic and professional people interested in infusing the Republican Party with new blood and fresh ideas. It was founded in Boston, Mass., in December 1962 by a group of law and graduate students and professors at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University. The Ripon Society now has chapters in several cities throughout the United States.

In response to my request, Ripon-New Haven submitted two papers. The first, prepared by Paul R. Lamoree, concludes that establishment of a mixed public-private high-speed ground transit corporation similar to Comsat is politically feasible. The second prepared by Richard Meyer, examines the idea from an eco-

nomic standpoint and concludes that it probably would be financially feasible.

Both papers are well done and should be of interest to those Members of Congress, Commerce Department officials, and private citizens who are involved in the research and development activity authorized by the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF THE PROPOSED HIGH-SPEED TRANSIT CORPORATION

(By Paul R. Lamoree)

Since the Satellite Communications Act of 1962 provides the inspiration for the plan to develop and implement a high-speed ground transportation system under the mixed aegis of the government and a federally-chartered, publicly-held corporation, a discussion of the proposal in terms of political theory can profitably proceed from a comparison of the proposal with its progenitor.

The primary considerations underlying each are the immense cost of preliminary research, which necessitates governmental participation and funding; the great import of the proposal for the lives of the citizenry, which justifies the resort to public resources, as well as requiring provisions for some degree of public control; and the sweeping scope of the project, which makes the decision as to governmental, private-stockholder, or mixed ownership one of great moment with respect to the balance of the public and private sectors. The differences between the two plans are equally pertinent to the suitability of the Comsat technique to the transportation field. Illustrative differences are the purely intra-national arena of the transportation plan in contrast to the international role of telecommunications, the dissimilarities between the roles of the existing rail industry in the high-speed system and that of the communications industry in the satellite system, and the relative degrees of technical development present in the two areas when the commercial aspects were first considered.

Each of these similarities and dissimilarities has some significance in a theoretical analysis of the transit proposal. Each goes to either dilute or reinforce the criticisms of the one system with respect to the other. On the whole, they all go to demonstrate that the type of public-private mixture created for use in the satellite field is even more desirable in the transportation area.

#### I. PROTECTING THE PUBLIC INVESTMENT

The central fact of the satellite program for our purposes was that the Corporation, which operates for profit, received the benefit of huge governmental outlays for basic and specific research. The Corporation was not required to reimburse the nation for these expenses, since such a requirement would, of course, have been prohibitive. But the critics of the proposal were incensed that the products of that research were to be put to commercial use, so that the consuming public would be required to pay for the resulting services on a tariff above cost, thereby, they argued, losing the benefit of their research investment to the stockholders. The greatest part of the criticism evolved directly from this pivotal fact of government investment, and a satisfactory plan for high-speed transit must assure the public the benefit of the development programs for which it must pay.

The weight of this objection to the Comsat program is illustrated by the size of the Government's role in developing the tech-

nical systems. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Department of Defense (DOD) together spent \$471.6 million on space communications research in the 1960-63 period. This figure does not include booster research which, according to testimony given before the Senate Committee by Assistant Secretary of Defense J. H. Rubel, constituted 90% of the total cost.

The public expenditure probably needed for high-speed ground transportation research prior to the stage of commercial feasibility is impossible to judge before it is determined what kind or kinds of systems will be pursued. The expenditure is also a function of the degree to which demonstration projects will be necessary to build public acceptance to a level of commercial practicality. An extreme figure may serve to define the problem: one research group working on a subterranean tubeway operating at near-sonic speeds has said that a minimal and non-commercial demonstration run is \$2 billion away. The less ambitious proposals would be proportionately cheaper, perhaps on the scale of the Northeast Corridor project now being probed. The more advanced the system, the more extensive the demonstration stage would likely have to be to overcome public reticence. Naturally people will be more reluctant to expose their senses and their fragile bodies to, e.g., jet-propelled Ground-Effect Machines than to 150 m.p.h. electric trains.

Despite the attendant uncertainties, it seems quite probable that the ultimate public outlay for research and development on as-yet visionary transit systems will far outstrip the investment in satellite communications. Thus the criticisms levelled at Comsat must be met, especially in view of the fact that space-relayed telecommunications were made possible by the spin-offs of a larger program spurred by considerations of national security and national prestige, while a ground transit system must be approached calculatingly on its own merits.

In addition, while the public role in space relays could cease upon the furnishing of information, a limited number of rockets, and launch facilities—except for continued regulation—it must be a more active one in transportation, for these reasons: first the initial runs are just the beginning of a development that will proceed upon its own logic across the continent; second the system, whichever is chosen, will require active government participation, at least to the extent of exercising eminent domain; and finally, political questions are posed by the deployment of the system, which may well become a major factor in the economy and demography of the nation.

#### A. Public ownership is inappropriate

In meeting this area of criticism, however, it is necessary to consider the possible alternatives. Given that there will be a high-speed transit system, the question becomes one of how best to assure the public a quid pro quo for its investment. This might be done by giving the government ownership of the system, or by structuring and regulating the privately-held enterprise to guarantee its responsiveness to the public interest.

The same quantum of expenditure that gives rise to concern for the taxpayers' return on their outlay strongly militates against government ownership: the potential eventual size and impact of the transit grid is so immense that public ownership of it would necessarily unsettle the balance between the public and private sectors of the economy. No exclusively federal domestic project has ever approached the implications of this one, unless it is electrification and flood control (a pregnant exception). Ownership would necessarily be active, in that a transit system requires a great deal of manpower to operate and vigorous direction of its growth. The government would therefore

be injected into the lives of its citizens in a highly significant fashion.

There are two other aspects of a transportation grid that distinguish it from, for example, public power or a hypothetical public satellite relay system: First, a transportation system of the sort envisioned deals directly with the ultimate consumer, since it is primarily a passenger device. Public power plants on the whole sell to regional co-operatives or private distributors, who serve to dilute the impact of government on the consumer's life. Even in schemes like Medicare the services are privately performed, with the government acting only as payor of fees and general supervisor of standards. Satellite communications, if they were under government ownership, would place as a buffer between the citizen-consumer and the government the communications service industries—the telephone, telegraph and broadcast companies.

Second, public power does not approach pre-emption of the field; there remains a healthy private power industry. Similarly a public satellite relay arrangement would not exhaust the telecommunications field: cables, micro-wave relays and scatter broadcasts can and do provide almost identical services to the same clientele. But a federal ground transportation grid would hold exclusive sway over the area of service, because no private competitor could manage the necessary capital investment to compete directly, or offer roughly parallel services, which would be rendered merely redundant by the geographical character of transportation services. Air, bus and conventional rail services are not sufficiently parallel to dilute the resulting federal monopoly, because of limitations of passenger capacity and speed inherent in their vehicles.

#### B. Organization and regulation: the pragmatic approach

If we reject public ownership, the question narrows to one of devising an adequate structure and mode of regulation for a "private" corporate system. This in turn divides into two practical problems: one of the organization of the owning and operating entity, and the other of allotting the supervisory role to a sufficiently vigorous regulatory body.

In these areas the high-speed ground transit field is more promising even than was the satellite relay field. And if sufficient safe-guards of these sorts can be provided, there will remain no good reason to invoke the spectre of public ownership.

##### 1. Structure of the Corporation

A review of the structure and possible weaknesses of the Comsat Corporation is instructive. The charter provides for thirteen directors, six each from the ranks of the participating communications companies and the public stockholders, and one representative of the public at large appointed by the President of the United States. Critics of the Act feared that the balance would be upset in favor of the industry, since it was likely that (1) large blocs of the publicly subscribed stock, with the attendant voting power, would fall into the hands of the suppliers of electronic equipment, whose interests are allegedly indistinguishable from those of the participating companies; and (2) the membership of the board would have to be drawn from the industry, there being few, if any, other sources of communications expertise.

Neither of these factors has comparable impact in the area of transportation, so a similar structure would be more nearly unexceptionable. In the first place, the railroads, which would be the counterparts of RCA and the like, have no supplier subsidiaries akin to, for example, Western Electric in the electronics field—the scope of railroad activity has been strictly circumscribed by law for decades. Moreover, the

independent suppliers of railroad equipment have much less integrated interests than their communications counterparts: rails come from the primary steel industry, the members of which have interests much too broad to converge with the railways rolling stock, traction equipment and components come from diverse companies such as Budd Coaches and General Motors.

In the second place, even if the pool of talent from which the directors would be drawn were limited to the rail and rail supply industries—but of course it would not be, since the new systems would involve as well for instance the airframe and exotic propulsion companies—the geographical bounds of the individual roads' markets would confute any tendency to bury the public interest in common private ones.

Furthermore, the high-speed grid would not be a mere adjunct to existing rail services, analogous to the space relay system, but would be a competing system standing to the railroads as airlines and buses now do.

Another of the fears expressed by the critics of the satellite corporation plan was that the industry directors would drag their feet in research and development to postpone the obsolescence of the industry's existing equipment. This criticism, too, has little validity in the transportation field, because (1) the railroads which would be most immediately affected—those with passenger service in the Northeast Corridor and in similar megalopolitan bands—have demonstrated little interest in preserving their passenger business, and have added little capital to passenger facilities recently enough to be concerned about unamortized investments; and (2) the high-speed system would probably not displace existing facilities, but would draw upon a new clientele composed of passengers who would otherwise either not make the trip, or go by air.

There was another troublesome potential conflict between in directors' interests as members of the satellite corporation board and as parties to the industry that is not meaningful in the transit context: ownership of the ground relay stations, which are analogous to rail terminals and home-to-terminal transportation was to remain with the separate companies, possibly creating a conflict of interest as to relevant policies. The age, locations and dense usage of existing terminals probably preclude their use with the new system, and there is no reason to believe that the existing roads will build new ones for the high-speed grid.

##### 2. Public Regulation

Many critics of the Comsat proposal charged that there was to be no effective public overseer of the resulting enterprise, pointing to the vacillations and equivocations in the record of the FCC as evidence of the inadequacy of the plan. But the most logical nominee for the regulatory role in the transit plan, the ICC, has a much stronger record, and transportation has proved an area more amenable to close supervision. The endemic problems of the FCC—understaffing, limited budget, and discontinuity of policy-making leadership—do not trouble the vigorous ICC.

In any case, adequate regulation is a relatively simple problem of legislative draftsmanship. Even if the initial provisions were to prove inadequate, improvements could be made later to satisfy any specific criticisms that might arise.

In short, the alternative to governmental ownership as a guaranty of the public investment is to be found in careful structuring of the corporation and energetic regulations by federal agencies suited to the task. For the reasons given, these approaches seem both sufficient and practical, while at the same time they promise not to disturb the delicate balance between the public and private sectors.

by either the Pennsylvania or New Haven Railroads and are not being considered as major stops in the thinking on radical systems. Since passenger service in the Northeast is a losing proposition at present there is little reason to expect any change in that situation on a short haul basis where increased speed becomes less important to the individual traveler. As a result, if we require the macroscopic Boston to Washington system to take over the passenger services between the intermediate points a drain on cash flow not accounted for in the calculations of Part II will be introduced.

The larger the scope of services conceived for such a system, the broader the financial participation will have to be. If one operates on the partial hypothesis that those who benefit from the system ought to pay for its development, then this principal of finance assumes a self evident nature.

The state governments are at present burdened with the subsidization of intermediate and commuter operation. If the operations involved in those services were merged with the overall system state and local governments might be amenable to financial participation in the overall system and the system itself would not be in the "giveaway" position of being responsible only for the potentially lucrative long haul passenger service without bearing the responsibility for intermediate and commuter service. At any rate an operation such as the one envisioned here, giving regional service, could function efficiently only with the coordinated efforts of all levels of government along with those private groups that are involved with the system, as partial owners or operators.

TABLE 1.—Regression data

Year	Passenger miles in all modes	Disposable personal income (in thousands)	Disposable income per capita	Population (in thousands)	Passenger miles per capita
	(4)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(5)
1952	575,345	\$238,312	\$1,594	150,393	3,679
1953	608,709	262,564	1,580	158,956	3,830
1954	625,113	257,445	1,500	161,884	3,861
1955	614,510	275,348	1,659	165,931	4,005
1956	690,006	293,170	1,736	168,903	4,125
1957	694,018	308,524	1,704	171,984	4,035
1958	704,452	318,826	1,823	174,882	4,028
1959	736,764	337,315	1,897	177,830	4,143
1960	700,733	350,044	1,937	180,684	4,210
1961	775,005	364,424	1,983	183,756	4,218
1962	801,450	385,267	2,064	186,656	4,294
1963	834,544	403,832	2,132	189,417	4,406

TABLE 2.—Estimates of gross revenue and cash flow in 1985

A. REVENUE (In millions)				
	Time elasticity		High	Low
	High	Low		
Population:			\$915	\$170
High			850	100
Low				
B. CASH FLOW (In millions)				
When:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Population	High	High	Low	Low
Time elasticity	High	High	High	Low
Operating ratio:				
High	\$265	\$50	245	45
Low	\$365	70	340	65

APPENDIX B.—Use of the least squares equation to forecast to 1985

Let  $T = \text{Passenger Miles Per Cap}$   
 $Y = \text{Disposable Income Per Cap}$   
 Then  $T = 2250.9 + 1.0044Y \quad R^2 = .92$   
 $T = 2250.9 + 1.044(4535)$   
 $T = 2250.9 + 4555 = 6800.9 \text{ or approx.}$   
 6801 miles per capita

APPENDIX A.—Estimation of disposable income per capita in 1985 ( $Y_{1985}$ )

	Disposable income	Population	Disposable income per capita
1929	\$83,120	122,000,000	\$681
1956	290,154	168,903,000	1,720

$$1 + \Gamma = \sqrt[27]{\frac{1720}{681}} = 1.0349$$

$$\Gamma = .0349 \text{ or app. } .035$$

Using  $Y_{1956} = \$2,132$  as the base:

$$Y_{1985} = \$2,132(1 + .035)^{27} = \$4,535$$

APPENDIX C.—Population projections for 1985 in the northeast corridor

(In thousands)

State	High estimate	Low estimate
Massachusetts	6,967	6,426
Rhode Island	1,099	993
Connecticut	3,930	3,756
New York	23,159	21,228
New Jersey	9,431	9,053
Pennsylvania	13,955	12,757
Delaware	750	715
Maryland	5,139	4,896
District of Columbia	1,165	1,096
Virginia	6,098	5,630
New Hampshire	906	859
Maine	1,255	1,124
Total	73,854	68,533

Source: Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 326, Feb. 7, 1966. High estimate, Census Series II-B; low estimate, Census Series I-D.

CAR PRICE INCREASES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the first American auto manufacturer has announced its retail prices for 1967 model cars. The Ford Motor Co. has made what it calls "price adjustments" which "average only \$25 per vehicle, or less than 1 percent."

But the New York Times headline this morning tells a different story: "Ford Prices Up an Average of \$112." The Wall Street Journal says: "Ford Raises Suggested Retail Prices on 1967 Models by an Average 4 Percent, Mostly To Cover Safety Features." How much has Ford raised its prices?

Last August 31, I urged the auto companies to "utilize the fruits of their mass production techniques and increases in productivity to keep the cost of safety down."

But now it seems clear that at least one manufacturer is trying to make an unfair profit out of safety. For example, last year optional deluxe seat belts cost \$14.53 more than regular seat belts. This year those seat belts have been made standard equipment. The additional \$14.53 is added to this year's car price. By retaining last year's optional price for the item, Ford has totally ignored the

mass production economies it must receive when switching from optional to standard equipment status for a given item.

Why is Ford passing last year's optional cost on to the consumer? We have said for years that "safety pays"—now we are finding out what safety costs, and the figures are grossly inflated. The same can be said for Volkswagen.

Another area of concern is the auto industry's insistence on quoting the Consumer Price Index for automobiles, as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. According to the Ford press releases of yesterday, that index "shows that the price of new cars had declined 6 percent over the past 7 years, while the prices of consumer items on the whole have risen 11 percent. The difference means a net savings of \$500 per car for the average customer today. In view of the higher prices currently showing up on other products and services, this favorable price relationship is likely to be increased again this year."

I do not like to see the American people overcharged with a Federal agency's statistics used as justification. To the man paying an average of \$112 a car more this year than last, it is meaningless to speak of "net savings." And to use the BLS index as support is misleading. The method of adjusting car prices to reflect quality changes in new models is far from a perfect system. Last April I raised this issue with Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz. He sent me a detailed explanation of the "BLS Procedures for Estimating the Market Value of a Quality Change in New Automobiles."

Most so-called "quality changes" are really standardization of once optional equipment. Yet nowhere in the BLS procedures do I find that the economies of mass production are taken into account.

In short, when Detroit quotes the Bureau of Labor Statistics on this point is it possible that Detroit is quoting itself? It will be interesting to see if the BLS, after making its complex adjustments, arrives at the same \$25, 1-percent increase Ford does. Mr. President, it would be more interesting—and far more important—if the BLS finally becomes more concerned with the impact on the consumer than on its index.

UMBRELLA FOR ASIA

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I believe it is true that one thing we fight for in Vietnam is time. We fight for time to permit the nations of Asia to draw together and establish their own effective instrumentality for maintaining peace and order and to balance off the power of mainland China.

In its lead editorial Sunday, the Washington Post referred to the views of President Marcos of the Philippines, our recent distinguished guest, who advocated an American umbrella for Asia, but not our continued presence on the mainland after stability is restored. His views, as the Post says, warrant consideration. So does, Mr. President, the editorial it-

September 21, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22649

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1965 *Statistical Abstract* 559.

The figure one selects for an estimated operating ratio is clearly crucial. The operating ratio equals the total operating expenses of the system divided by the total operating revenues. In this report expenses will be defined as excluding depreciation. One applies the operating ratio estimate to the estimated revenue in order to produce an estimated cash flow. As a high estimate the report used the average operating ratio of Class I U.S. railroads for the period 1954-1963 which equaled 78% less a discount of 7% for depreciation expenses which are not to be included in the analysis under the cash flow method. (That discount is based on the ratio of depreciation to total operating expenses for the Pa. R.R. in 1965, 1965 *Annual Report of the Pa. R.R.* 44-5) Thus the high estimate of operating ratio equals 71%. 78 *I.C.C. Ann. Rep.* 141 (1964). As a low estimate we arbitrarily selected 65%. There can be little question that the operating structure of a radical rail system will be reflected in an operating ratio much lower than that of conventional railroads because the labor costs which today represent a large proportion of railroad operating expenses will be very low in a radical system. See 213-2 *Scientific American* 37 (1965). The estimates of cash flow produced by the application of these two projected operating ratios appear in Table 2.

## III

In view of the results of the strict cash flow method estimates, the quantity of social benefits which may be earned and social costs avoided becomes crucial in deciding whether or not a radical rail system is feasible. We must be able to say exactly how much in the way of social benefits we require above the orthodox projected cash flow in order to justify the construction of such a system. In order to decide that we must first analyze the capital market likely to be encountered by such a venture. The significance of the cash flow estimates for 1985 can best be judged in relation to the problem of financing a capital outlay of about \$2 billion, an accepted estimate of the cost of a radical rail system for the Northeast Corridor. Lessing, "The 400 mph Passenger Train", 71-4 *Fortune* 218 (1965).

Fundamentally, there are two forms of finance—equity and debt. Equity means common or preferred stock although we shall speak only of the former to simplify matters. For every enterprise there exists some optimum combination of debt and equity, i.e. an optimum financial structure for that particular industry. Debt is cheaper than equity financing but it adds more risk since the interest on bonds is contractually fixed while dividends on common stock may be passed. On the other hand, it is to the advantage of the stock holders to have a higher proportion of debt because then the return on the common stock will be higher. The use of debt or prior claim funds to raise the rate of return on the common stock is known as the use of leverage and is a perfectly sound financial practice if pursued to a degree commensurate with the stability of operation of the firm. Thus the firms in relatively stable industries as utilities and the railroads in the old days adopted a more risky financial structure. Schwartz, *supra* at 67-9, 138.

It seems to us that the radical rail system under investigation in this report might of necessity be a highly leveraged project but at the same time might be a stable enough operation to merit such a structure.

The Communications Satellite Corporation capitalized itself with an initial sale of about \$200 million of common stock. That sale was quite a successful operation considering the somewhat speculative nature of buying the shares of a corporation with no earnings foreseeable for several years. It is true that A.T. & T. floated a stock issue

of \$1.25 billion several years ago but investors generally are eager to purchase shares of such a high investment quality. The point to be made is that the report thinks it unlikely that any private or semi-private corporation set up to construct a system as is envisaged here could succeed in raising much more than Comsat did in the way of equity capital particularly in light of the recent paucity of earnings in rail passenger service and in spite of the indication of Part II of this paper that a profitable market for this type of operation might well exist.

Consequently, it appears that debt will have to be the primary source of capital for such a corporation and, in a sense this may make the common stock that is issued very attractive due to the resulting degree of leverage. If the firm could sell as much common stock as COMSAT did it would have to carry a debt of about \$1.8 billion which at a cost of about 4% would mean a debt service of about \$70 million per annum. (The yield on top quality corporate bonds from 1921 to 1960, which is a good measure of the cost of long term capital, was about 4%. Barger, *Money, Banking and Public Policy* 367 (1962)).

If we assume that potential investors an after tax return of about 6% on the total assets of the firm then the cash flow before taxes but after depreciation will have to equal about \$310 million. Of that figure \$70 million would be paid out in interest on the debt and about \$120 million in corporate income taxes, leaving a net income after taxes of about \$120 million. Turning to the cash flow figures denoted in Table 2, one can see that without significant social returns a radical rail system will be feasible only if the most favorable assumptions as to the effect of time elasticity and operating ratio are operative. In all other cases, particularly where the effect of time elasticity is low due to the attrition of the conventional railroad passenger base upon which the projected decrease in time needed to travel in the Corridor will operate, the social return will have to be very high—on the order of between \$50 million and \$250 million a year—to justify building the system.

From our point of view the social benefits of such a system appear to be significant. The region would save at least the following costs by building the system, all of which ought really to be given positive weight as supplements to the cash flow: the high cost of building more highways particularly in this area where rights of way are expensive; the cost of a great expansion in air facilities to accommodate an ever increasing flow of traffic; the cost of increased central city parking facilities and bus terminals, not to mention the sheer madness of encouraging increased auto traffic in the central cities; and the probable loss in real estate tax revenues as central cities become more congested and therefore even undesirable for business purposes. (Witness the decentralization of retail business represented by the development of the shopping center as a response to consumer reluctance to drive into downtown areas.) Moreover, the construction of such a system would provide many jobs over a long period of time; our defense mobility would be increased; increased decentralization of industry would be facilitated by improved accessibility to both product and labor markets; and beautification of the countryside will be aided by reduction of surface travel.

If sufficient social benefits can be adduced and quantified to render the project profitable under the discounted cash flow method then the question of Federal participation would become relevant. A Federal role would be imperative for two reasons: (1) the financial structure hypothesized above before introducing the discussion of social benefits is too risky to attract sufficient interest in the orthodox capital market, and (2) Private investors cannot and will not bear the full financial burden of developing and con-

structing a radical rail system whose "revenues" in large measure consist of social benefits and not conventional dollar revenues arising from day to day operation.

The Federal government has played a large role in the development of other forms of transportation and communication and thus, Congress should not hesitate to embark upon a degree of participation in this area if the project is deemed advisable. The Federal government has built the highways upon which autos and buses travel and has aided the building of airports used by our profitable airlines not to mention the largesse represented by lucrative mail subsidies. Mecklin, *supra*, at 194. Moreover, the basic research and development of the earth satellite and rocket delivery systems which will eventually be used by COMSAT was performed and financed by the Federal government albeit for defense purposes. Nevertheless COMSAT will in a very large sense be reaping where it has not sown.

The financial instrument of government participation may be one of several alternatives which will depend very much on the type of institutional structure one wishes the system to have. For example, if one desired a relatively large say for the government in the system one could request the Congress to authorize the purchase of common stock by the Federal government beyond the amount salable in the open market to public investors. One might have the system issue convertible debentures to the government so that the latter would have the relative security of a prior claim instrument with an opportunity to share in the growth of the system if it become highly successful by exercising the option to convert the debentures to common stock. This would involve a large measure of Federal control if the conversion were undertaken. This last alternative might be attractive to those Congressmen who would oppose a direct appropriation for research and development as being some sort of giveaway in view of the fact that the system might turn out to be quite a profitable investment according to the analysis presented in Part II of this report. On the other hand these same Congressmen would probably raise the spectre of government interference in the event of conversion to common stock.

The Federal government might simply elect to purchase ordinary debentures or bonds as a means of supplementing the market demand for debt obligations of the system. On the other hand the Fed. gov't. might make itself the guarantor of obligations issued by the system. This is not distinguishable from the government actually buying the bonds in so far as bearing risk is concerned but, it does prevent the government from earning anything from the ownership of the bonds.

From a combination of political and economic viewpoints the ideal instrument of Federal participation might be that of leasing that part of the structures built by the Federal government. If the system proved able to earn sizeable revenues it could afford to pay the full cost of construction in terms of rentals from the government. If the system proved not so profitable in pure dollar terms the rental could be less, thus constituting a partial subsidy. Surely, such a sliding scale lease could be constructed by legal draftsmen. Moreover, the subsidy if necessary would be partially concealed under the disguise of a lease thus making the whole arrangement more acceptable politically.

The state and local governments whose constituents would benefit from such a system might also participate financially by owning stocks or bonds or by constructing and leasing facilities in the various stops of the system. The issue of state and local government participation is particularly relevant to the problem of service to intermediate points such as New Haven, Trenton and Wilmington that are currently served

September 21, 1966

22651

self. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### UMBRELLA FOR ASIA

Forthright support by President Marcos for the American effort in Vietnam will be warmly appreciated in this country at a time when many Asian countries speak in accents of anxiety and equivocation. And precisely because the Filipino leader has so stanchly affirmed his determination to resist Communist aggression, "whether perpetrated openly or by proxy," his views on the character of the post-Vietnam U.S. military presence in Asia should be given the closest consideration.

The Marcos conception of the American role in Asia strikes a middle path between those at one extreme who would repudiate any American responsibility for Asian security and others who forget that the basic responsibility must rest with the Asian countries themselves. He envisages an "American umbrella," but not a forward strategy involving the continuing presence of U.S. forces on the Asian mainland. If a non-Communist South Vietnam can be secured, Mr. Marcos declared, the basis would be laid for establishing a new Asia-wide collective security grouping. Then, "when this has been done, American military power could withdraw to existing bases in the outlying islands and archipelagoes: Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan and the Philippines. Together with the U.S. Seventh Fleet, this line of defense off the Asian mainland could be rendered completely impregnable, while offering needed support to any mainland nation that may be threatened by Communist power."

Mr. Marcos showed an admirable sense of realism and statesmanship in advocating an Asia-wide association based "not on the narrow ideological alignments of the cold war but on the inescapable reality of Asian diversity." Clearly, any meaningful system of Asian security would have to embrace such key capitals as Tokyo, Djakarta and New Delhi in addition to those hitherto represented in SEATO, and in the new Association for Southeast Asia formed by the Philippines, Thailand and Malaysia. It has been encouraging to see the ASA reaching out for broader Asian contacts in recent months—a trend which will, we hope, gain increasing momentum. But as Mr. Marcos stressed, the countries along China's periphery will be unable to balance the nuclear power of their giant neighbor "singly or together" for some years to come, and must continue to rely on the capacity of the United States for prompt and effective intervention.

#### UNITED NATIONS: U THANT'S GLOOMY CONCLUSIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the United Nations has begun its second 20 years on what the distinguished American newspaperman, James Reston, calls "a melancholy note."

In his column in the New York Times for this morning, he discusses the gloomy conclusions of U Thant, the basic problem involved in Vietnam, and what he considers the interesting possibility of United Nations action in the matter.

I commend Mr. Reston's splendid article to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that its text appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### UNITED NATIONS: U THANT'S GLOOMY CONCLUSIONS

(By James Reston)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., September 20.—The United Nations has started its second twenty years on a melancholy note. "The relationship between the big powers," said the Secretary General, U Thant, "has dropped to a new low. To my knowledge, there has not been any meaningful dialogue between Washington and Moscow for a long time. I think it is a very regrettable situation."

#### THE FORGOTTEN PROGRESS

Regrettable this no doubt is, but to conclude that the big powers have reached a "new low" is going a bit too far. That is very low indeed. Not so many years ago the "meaningful dialogue" between the delegates from Moscow and Washington was rattling everybody's back teeth. Bad as Vietnam is, and will become when the General Assembly starts debating the war in a few days, it is nothing compared to the old days when the Russians were waving their rockets and pounding the U.N. desks with their shoes.

The last time the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union had a "meaningful dialogue" was at Vienna in 1961. It was a shouting match over Berlin, with Khrushchev threatening war, and it was so "meaningful" that President Kennedy came home and increased the American defense budget by \$6 billion, and sent another U.S. division to Europe.

The main thing about the relations between the big powers today is that, despite all the provocations in Southeast Asia, they are restraining their power and fighting a limited war for limited ends. Vietnam may be a damn silly conflict, as most of the delegates here seem to feel, but all the big powers involved are intervening just enough to keep the balance of power from being upset.

"The east-west *détente* was developing very well until 1963," the Secretary General remarked, but is this true? In 1962, the Soviets were sending to Cuba missiles capable of hitting almost every city in the United States. All the atomic powers were polluting the world's atmosphere with radioactive dust, and the United States was still thinking it could win wars 10,000 miles from home without too much agony. Everybody knows better now—not much better, but some.

#### THE CONTINUING DIALOGUE

There is no lack of "dialogue" between the big powers on Vietnam. Secretary of State Dean Rusk will be talking to the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, about it at the Waldorf this week. The U.S. and Chinese ambassadors have been chewing it over in Warsaw for months, and almost a hundred foreign ministers will no doubt have a few words to say on the topic here over the next few weeks.

It may even be that something will come out of all this once the delegates focus on the main question. This is whether the balance of power is to be changed by force of arms in Southeast Asia, and the forthcoming debate in the General Assembly here will give the United States an opportunity to make clear that it is neither prepared to allow Hanoi, Moscow and Peking to change the balance of power there by war, nor that Washington is trying to change the balance by keeping its power in that peninsula.

The delegates to this General Assembly, if they are faithful to the first principle of the U.N. Charter—that force shall not be used to achieve political ends—may still help find a compromise based on this principle.

The basic problem is that Hanoi, Moscow and Peking do not believe the United States when it says it does not want to keep its military power and military bases in Vietnam. It is still apparently inconceivable to

them that the United States would fight a war at a cost of \$2 billion a month and then go away when the fighting stops and leave the people of that country free to determine their own political future.

Yet even all the critics in the United States, who have been condemning the past policies of their own country in Vietnam, agree that this is indeed the policy of President Johnson now. He is trying to put an end to that struggle and get out, and he needs the help of the United Nations to do so.

#### THE U.N.'S CHANCE

As things now stand, he cannot convince Hanoi, Moscow and Peking that this is his policy, but maybe he can convince them by authorizing the United Nations to supervise a cease-fire and a phased withdrawal of all combatants and the dismantling of all military bases.

The war is not going on because the relationship between the big powers has reached a "new low" or because there is no "meaningful dialogue" among the representatives of these powers, but because each side in the war thinks the other side is trying to change the balance of power by force of arms.

The United States Government is prepared for a cease-fire and a specific timetable for withdrawal, and it will be interesting to see whether the United Nations is ready to test this offer, to help carry it out, and to put the same proposition to the other side. If it is, the General Assembly debate will at least produce the "meaningful dialogue" Secretary General Thant wants.

#### THE VICE PRESIDENT'S COURAGEOUS ROLE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I was extremely pleased to read an editorial in the Washington Post of September 20 commenting on the forthright and courageous speech which Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY delivered at Howard University last Sunday.

The Post, in lauding the Vice President, commented:

He has been spending his credit with racial minorities to obtain order; and risking his standing with people who clamor for order to obtain progress. And if we get both progress and order, it will be in part because the Vice President has been willing to speak in both audiences where one or the other is unpopular.

This is richly deserved commendation of the Vice President's efforts. It has long been characteristic of him to disregard personal political considerations when he feels it in the interest of the country and the welfare of its people to speak out.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert the editorial in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1966]

#### HUMPHREY'S CONTRIBUTION

Vice President HUMPHREY, in his address at Howard University on Sunday, put the anguishing crisis of the civil rights movement at this juncture in two clear sentences.

"We cannot acquiesce," he said, "to those who would destroy our system of laws and justice through violence, riots and civil unrest . . . who fail to understand that rights and responsibilities are bound together in the tightly woven fabric of society."

And then he added: "But neither can we acquiesce to those conditions which have contributed so directly to the outrage we

encounter among so many who believe themselves sentenced to lives of poverty, dependency and misery."

The Vice President brings good credentials to the role of counsellor of those who are trying to correct ancient wrongs. He has a right to ask them to listen to him. His record gives him that right. And he has, as well, claims on the credibility of those he asks to advance the effort against discrimination.

When the fever of riot and civil disturbance is over and the days of discrimination have ended, it will be difficult to allocate credit. But in the distribution of any rewards that are made for tireless exertion in behalf of both causes, the Vice President should not be overlooked. He has been spending his credit with racial minorities to obtain order; and risking his standing with people who clamor for order to obtain progress. And if we get both progress and order, it will be in part because the Vice President has been willing to speak for both in audiences where one or the other is politically unpopular.

#### THE FAST DEPLOYMENT LOGISTIC SHIP PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the fast deployment logistic ship program represents a Department of Defense proposal which I believe to be both philosophically faulty and economically unsound. Under the terms of this program, the Department of Defense proposes to procure approximately 40 ships at a cost of well over \$1 billion for combat loading of military equipment and prepositioning in the vicinity of world trouble spots to meet any possible emergency.

I am firmly convinced that this plan is unsound in several respects. It is unlikely that we could have a sufficient number of ships to supply adequately a large force at a given place and time or cover all potential danger areas simultaneously. On the other hand, it is likely that the rapid obsolescence of military hardware and the rapid deterioration which characterizes ships and embarked equipment during long periods at sea would seriously impair the effectiveness of this program.

Beyond these considerations are the serious economic and policy questions involved. The United States is currently faced with a maritime crisis of major proportions. Our commercial fleet is now heavily overcommitted to the handling of Vietnam cargo with a resultant neglect of our trade routes and loss to our balance of payments. Our reserve fleet is approaching exhaustion and our ship replacement program is more than 90 ships behind.

The Defense Department has consistently maintained that we have no maritime problem—that our fleet is adequate. But, in fact, what the Defense Department is now proposing to do is to build its own merchant marine—a merchant marine owned and operated by the Government—but a merchant marine of limited-use ships which are destined to rust on station.

I am reliably informed that the same investment by the Government in our present maritime construction subsidy program could provide the United States with more than 100 modern vessels

which would be immediately available to the Government in times of emergency but which would contribute substantially to the American economy and our international balance of payments during times of peace. Such a shipbuilding program is the only way to raise the United States from its currently embarrassing position as ninth among the seapowers of the world.

Mr. President, on Tuesday evening I had the pleasure of attending a discussion of this subject and participating in a panel sponsored by the flagship section of the American Society of Naval Engineers. On that occasion, Mr. Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, presented a detailed critique of the FDLs program. I believe that his words should be carefully considered by every Congressman and Senator who will be responsible for passing on the appropriations for this project, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hood's address be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### THE IMPLICATIONS OF MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENTS ON THE U.S. SHIPYARD INDUSTRY

(Speech by Edwin M. Hood, President, Shipbuilders Council of America, Before The Flagship Section, American Society of Naval Engineers, American Chemical Society Auditorium, Washington, D.C., September 20, 1966)

For many years, the methods by which ships are procured in this country have varied only slightly. The United States Navy, the Maritime Administration, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, as well as commercial shipping operators have, to a very large extent, been obliged to order their vessels on a contract-by-contract basis, or at best in very small lots, because of limited government or private financing.

The output of modern, efficient oceangoing vessels has thus failed to meet urgent sea power requirements. There has been no comprehensive program. Much existing capacity for shipbuilding has remained idle. Skilled shipyard craftsmen have accordingly sought employment in other industries offering more stability and greater security. Shipbuilding has provided little attraction to young people of promising ability. And, the full potential of the shipyard industry has yet to be realized.

Since 1958, the average contract for the construction of merchant vessels, under governmental auspices, has involved only 3.4 ships. Only minimum attention has been given the desirability of consolidating or combining contracts so as to take advantage of series production and attendant cost savings. With certain few exceptions, the same could be said for the procurement of naval vessels.

All of this has taken place at a time in history when the importance of strength on the oceans to national security has been increasingly self-evident. To support this assertion, one need only refer to the role that shipyards, shipping and/or ships played in the Suez crisis, the Korean action, the Lebanon incident, and the Cuban affair. More recent experiences at the Gulf of Tonkin and in maintaining the logistics of supplying our troops in Southeast Asia and elsewhere furnish added endorsement and new dimensions to the lasting doctrine of sea power. In addition, the impressive merchant ship construction endeavors of the So-

viet Union suggest an unprecedented phase of cold war economic confrontation with ocean shipping as a key element.

Yet, more than 80 percent of the vessels in the U.S. Navy are 20 years of age or older. More than 80 percent of the ships in the American merchant marine are 20 years of age and older. Hundreds of naval and merchant vessels built in World War II ride at anchor in mothball status. The continuing value of these reserve fleets in terms of today's varying often sophisticated military commitments has become an issue of controversy with overwhelming expert opinion on the side of their becoming "worthless rustbuckets." Some 300 merchant ships, most of which have already been restored to active duty for the Vietnam conflict, represent a costly, second-rate sea lift capability. The 1,100 more uneconomic, inefficient and obsolete vessels which comprise the balance of the maritime defense reserve fleet are destined for scrapping. They could only be placed in service at abnormally high cost with only marginal assurances as to reliability.

This brief summary is sufficient to illustrate the condition of our nation's sea power resources. These facts have occasioned an awakening concern by governmental officials and others. Many divergent points of view as to appropriate solutions have been expressed. Those genuinely alarmed by the high degree of obsolescence in our merchant and naval fleets and by the economic health of our shipyards have posed searching questions that need to be reasonably answered. Their questions are directed primarily to this introspection: First, how to upgrade our sea power to a size and quality our national interests dictate with optimum utilization of resources and manpower; and secondly, how to create an environment which will encourage expanded ship construction programs in U.S. shipyards at the lowest possible costs. No doubt, there can be more than one answer to these questions.

The necessity for massive ship replacements offers to American initiative and ingenuity the challenge of developing and introducing new concepts, different methods and advanced technology. In other words, the opportunity exists to produce ships of more optimum design characteristics and operating features from those of the past to realize minimum costs. And, to be effective, these replacements must be accomplished in a relatively short time frame.

How to do this? That is the overriding question!

There are, of course, the "instant experts" who advocate an arbitrary division of shipbuilding contracts—some of U.S. yards and some for foreign yards—which could only lead to confusion and chaos. By any such scheme, the national security would ultimately be gravely undermined, and irreparable damage would be done to the nation's economy, shipyard resources and the balance of international payments. The differences between our economic system, contractual customs and specification details and those of other countries would inevitably lead to conflicting problems. U.S. operators would have to be almost omniscient to predict whether their ships would be built here or abroad. Financial planning would also be difficult to forecast and arrange.

Fortunately, to this point, wiser judgments have prevailed. The means to build ships economically are here. We need only to apply them wisely and well. Shipyards in all sections of the United States have successfully pursued cost reductions programs. Productivity has steadily improved. Management and production techniques have progressed, and facilities have considerably improved and modernized. Simultaneously, there has been increasing appreciation of the intrinsic value of ordering identical ships in

unilaterally in this field and opened the way for discussion of a joint program.

As a result of the understanding and cooperation of Scovill management and the leadership of Local 1604, a successful and effective joint program has been developed. To ensure its success and effectiveness, the company and the union agreed to share all costs and to conduct a truly joint operation.

Woodrow Hunter, research associate at the University of Michigan who has worked closely with the UAW for many years and is the nation's leading authority on pre-retirement education for industrial workers, spent two full weeks in Waterbury training company and union discussion leaders for the program. The training involved more than familiarizing the prospective leaders with films, materials and methods. Hunter also took them through practice sessions with several groups of older workers who constituted the first volunteers for the program.

Following the initial training program, the joint committee set up an actual schedule of discussion sessions starting on October 22, 1964, and running three days a week for two hours a day through June 24, 1965.

During this period, about 400 older members and their wives were involved in the program. After a summer recess, the program was re-instituted in September 1965 on essentially the same schedule.

While it is difficult to measure the results of such programs scientifically, both management and the union think the program has been very worthwhile. But even more important are the almost universally favorable reactions of the participants themselves. In addition, both the company and the union have won wide acclaim in Waterbury, Connecticut, and throughout the state and nation for their unique and pioneering efforts. They are in constant demand for panel discussions before management, labor and community groups, including a recent appearance at the annual meeting of the National Council on the Aging in Washington, D.C. A similar group journeyed to Toronto in January 1966 to present the program for discussion at the Canadian National Conference on Aging. The Scovill program has demonstrated the wisdom, value and effectiveness of joint programs. It is hoped a pattern has been established which will carry over into other major companies.

In April 1965, the UAW embarked on a similar joint program with the Chrysler Corporation. This program is now operative under the UAW-Chrysler Joint Pension Board of Administration in all Chrysler plants in Michigan, Indiana, Missouri, California, Delaware and New York. It was initiated in Chrysler of Canada in January 1966.

Much of the same pattern has been followed at Chrysler that was developed in the UAW-Scovill program. After a series of preliminary planning meetings with representatives of the UAW-Chrysler Joint Board of Administration, ten representatives of the company and ten from the union were selected for basic training as discussion leaders. Woodrow Hunter was again invited to conduct the training. In addition to basic indoctrination in the subject, films, readings and methods of the program, each team was given the opportunity to conduct a "live" discussion program with one or more groups of older employees.

Following a week of intensive training, the leaders were then asked to begin a discussion program of their own. Starting on May 1, 1965, and running through December, 60 five-week discussion programs were conducted in the Detroit area alone and more than 2,200 UAW-Chrysler members and their wives completed the program.

The only essential difference between the Chrysler and Scovill programs has been in the scheduling. Whereas the Scovill groups

meet in part on company time, the Chrysler groups meet in the evenings from 7 to 9 p.m. The Chrysler program is also much more complex to administer since the decision was made to schedule programs in a number of different geographical locations convenient to the older members and their wives.

The major problem encountered has been in recruiting and sustaining the active participation of resource people for the sessions dealing with health, legal problems, housing and the creative use of time. While it is fairly easy to recruit doctors, lawyers, housing and recreation specialists for one or two sessions, it is difficult to get such expert help to volunteer its services indefinitely without some form of compensation.

Throughout the summer months, the UAW-Chrysler program was extended to other Chrysler plants outside the Detroit area, including Port Huron, Michigan; New Castle and Indianapolis, Indiana; St. Louis, Missouri; Twinsburg, Ohio; New Castle, Delaware; Los Angeles, California and Syracuse, New York. This was done by sending union-management leadership teams from Detroit to each of these locations to train local leaders. Two or more 5-week programs have been successfully completed in each of these locations. In all, more than 100 discussion leaders have now been trained by the company and the union and more than 213 different resource people have become involved in the program.

Periodic staff evaluations of the program have been conducted under the leadership of the Joint Board and Professor Hunter, with the Detroit area discussion leaders in attendance. These sessions have resulted in some basic decisions designed to expand and modify the program in a variety of ways. But, by and large, they have revealed a remarkable degree of favorable consensus concerning the value and effectiveness of pre-retirement education as a joint labor-management responsibility.

A second form of evaluation has been conducted by members of the Joint Pension Board, which has made unannounced visits to various groups to observe the quality of leadership, teamwork, use of films and materials, use and quality of resource people, extent of group participation, etc.

A third major development in pre-retirement education has occurred in the UAW Agricultural Implement Department, which has adapted the basic program to its own needs and has trained UAW servicing staff and local union leadership to conduct union-sponsored discussion programs for older union members. This program has been introduced successfully in communities such as Davenport, Iowa; Moline and Chicago, Illinois; Louisville, Kentucky and Springfield, Ohio. Similar union-sponsored and staffed programs have been successfully conducted in a number of UAW local unions in Michigan, New York, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois and Connecticut.

The joint study committee at American Motors also has expressed interest in the possibility of joint programs and the union hopes that pilot installation somewhere in Michigan or Wisconsin can be found to demonstrate the wisdom of a cooperative approach.

In the meantime, the UAW also is moving ahead on an unilateral basis in General Motors and Ford local unions, hoping that someday these giants of the industry will become as enlightened as they are big.

For the day is surely coming when retirement years will constitute at least a fourth, and maybe as much as a third, of the life-work-retirement cycle. Surely ways must be found to help people to approach these years with understanding, insight and a sense of confidence about their ability to cope with change. Surely retirement can be a better time of life for the millions engaged in it or entering upon it if a little harder effort is made to make it so.

If we accept as a matter of course the need to invest 12 to 16 years in formal education for work, why is it asking too much to expect society, including labor, management and government, to invest the equivalent of 24 man-hours of educational effort in each older worker before he retires? If we are to invest increasing billions in pensions, social security, health care, housing and health and welfare services for the aged, there also must be a responsibility for helping individual older people to help themselves to make better use of their own resources and those that will be provided as needed from public and voluntary sources.

It is to be hoped that increasing numbers of responsible people in government, labor, industry and the related fields of social welfare also will agree and join in providing this badly needed and relatively inexpensive educational and preventive service.

#### THE UAW SCOVILL PLAN

The UAW-Scovill program works so well because the content and structure and operation of the courses were worked out cooperatively. Here are the main lines of the program.

1. Topics discussed are important to the retirees: Work and Retirement; Health; Family and Friends; Living Arrangements; Financial Planning; Managing Your Money; Legal Affairs; Leisure Time.
2. A joint committee, made up of four members each from union and management prepares publicity materials indicating joint sponsorship.
3. In leading discussions, trained union and company personnel alternate at each session. Top-level company and union officials are involved in the program.
4. Each employe participating does so on company time for one and a half hours and contributes the same amount of his own time. Spouses are urged to attend and many do.
5. Materials such as discussion guides, workbooks, pamphlets, films and certificates are financed jointly by union and company.
6. Resource people from the community include social security experts, social workers, adult educators, librarians, public housing officials, UAW drop-in center officials and university home economists.
7. Participants come from all parts of the Scovill works, including salaried employes in the office, engineering and sales departments.

### More Benefits From the Vietnamese Election

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent election in South Vietnam may turn out to be a milestone in the tragic history of that nation. Much good has come of it already.

Bob Considine comments on some of the benefits accruing to the Vietnamese in the following column from September 14, 1966, edition of the New York World Journal Tribune.

I commend this column to the attention of our colleagues:

VIETNAM ELECTION PUT RESTRAINT ON CORRUPTION

(By Bob Considine)

SAIGON.—Our top people here feel they did what was best for the country when they

wanted to come; and we wrote him to go ahead.

We had some fine young horses and cows and nice hogs. We had two big iron grey horses, Prince and Barney. We let them go first, but we hated to give them up. These horses were so pretty hitched up to our buggy holding all the family. Seemingly, they took us as fast as cars do now. I'd get scared sometimes that they would go so fast.

Then we sold our pretty cows and calves. We sold the old sow I mentioned to a neighbor one day and she died the next. She brought \$12.00. We began to feel as though we were making the biggest mistake of our lives, but too late to back out now. I think it was 1915 when we left and went to northern Arkansas and to the saw mill. Then to Mena, Arkansas, in 1919 after two different locations in Montgomery County, Arkansas. We had just about made a living. The men got a contract in Oklahoma and made good. Martin's health got bad and for eight years he wasn't able to work.

But things had changed at our old home in Oklahoma. The sand storms had come. The neighbors around there had moved away. We only got \$500.00 for our farm when we had been offered \$2,000.00. So we began to see that all thing had worked together for the good. It was a miracle how well we got through; and especially since Martin passed on in 1935.

The last year he worked he said we would give a tenth of every dollar to the Lord's work. We gave \$10.00 a month and then at the end of the year he wrote out two checks, one for foreign missions and one for home missions, each check for \$45.00. Then he could not work anymore.

I think most of our disappointments are blessings in disguise. For instance, we were unhappy for four or five years thinking we had made a mistake by leaving our home in Oklahoma. Then how well it was shown us we had not.

I thank God things have been so well. I have a good home and everything I need which millions and millions do not have.

Do as near right as you can and trust in God and all will be well.

### Scovill and UAW Local 1604 Pioneer in Preretirement Education

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO American Federationist published an article in its September 1966 issue about a unique educational program. This program constitutes a forward-looking attempt to meet a growing social problem—the effective use of leisure time by retired workers.

The Scovill Manufacturing Co. and UAW Local 1604 of Waterbury, Conn., which are in my district have jointly recognized that it is as necessary to prepare for the retired years of an individual's life as it is to prepare for the work years.

Through the cooperative efforts of union and management, a pioneer program in preretirement education has been born. The basic format is being used as a pattern for other joint programs across the Nation. It calls for

contributions of time, effort and interest from union and management alike. Also, the participant must give equally of his own time to match the free time offered by the employer.

I have always been interested in the well-being of retired workers. This preretirement program, which was developed in Waterbury, will undoubtedly enrich the lives of the many retired workers it reaches and will inevitably benefit many individuals, communities and the Nation. Therefore, it is with a deep sense of pride in my hometown and my fellow citizens who have carried out this progressive idea that I include this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### AN URGENT NEED: EDUCATION FOR RETIREMENT

(By Charles E. Odell)

(NOTE.—Charles E. Odell recently was named Special Assistant to the Director of the U.S. Employment Service, Department of Labor. He formerly was Director of the Auto Workers' Older and Retired Workers Department. Before that, he spent 20 years with USES, specializing in problems of older workers.)

We are fast approaching a three-phased life-work-retirement cycle—a period when the typical American conceivably can spend as much of his total life span in the retirement phase as he spends in the work phase and in the preparation for work phase.

To a work-oriented society, this may not sound like a very happy prospect. But to a "Great Society" which sees work as a means to the end of creative leisure this could be a happy prospect, indeed. In any event, it is very likely to happen and the question which must be answered is how working people can be best prepared for such a life-work-retirement cycle.

Evidence of the existence of a problem was provided by the first three months of experience under the early retirement program negotiated by the United Auto Workers and the automobile and agricultural implement companies. The plan took effect September 1, 1965. Despite a booming economy and relatively high levels of demand for skilled and experienced manpower in these industries, it is significant that more than 10,500 UAW members age 55 to 65 retired under the new early retirement programs.

There can be no doubt that these early retirements created opportunities for advancement and new employment for almost an equal number of younger people. But of equal importance is the fact that a new pattern of work and retirement is being established. These new earlier retirees, by virtue of an income approaching \$400, can expect to maintain their standard of living in retirement. The challenge before them and us as a society is to help them to find a meaningful and useful role and function that will sustain them in their extended period of retirement time. The new trend toward earlier retirement, therefore, adds an even greater sense of urgency to the problem of establishing an extensive preparation program.

Through great effort, the United States finally has achieved the opportunity, more or less universal, of free public education for all its citizens through twelve grades of school, or at least until age sixteen. There is now the very real possibility of extending the years of schooling to age 20 or 21 in order to better prepare youth for the demands of an accelerating technology. There is also the increasing prospect of free continuing adult education of a vocational-technical and cultural nature for those whose jobs are threatened or wiped out by accelerating technological change. Recently, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz proposed a system of paid sabbaticals for most workers which

would give them time to retrain or to develop new skills or, perhaps, prepare for retirement.

These ideas are still in the talk stage, although in a limited way something is being done about them for selected groups of Americans. By the same token, there is a responsibility for doing something to help the working population to prepare for retirement. If it is important to educate and train intensively for a career and to retrain intensively for occupational-technological change, it also is important to train people for retirement.

Retirement presents many drastic changes which are just as rough and just as difficult in terms of individual and family adjustments as those involved in growing up and preparing for work and those brought on by occupational and technological changes. Many problems must be faced: changes in income; changes in status in the family, in the community, in the club; changes in attitudes of friends and associates in the union or the professional society; changes in the nature of daily routine, in the circle of friends, in living arrangements. Yet very few people have the benefit of any systematic opportunity to anticipate these changes and to explore their meanings for a reasonably happy, healthy and successful retirement.

Ideally, community adult education agencies should be of great assistance and in a few places they have been. For the most part, however, adult educators have not been able to mount significant retirement planning programs.

In the instances where such programs have been successful, the primary sponsor has been a union or an employer, or a union and an employer working jointly to recruit the group of participants. From this experience, the UAW has concluded that the union has a primary responsibility for the promotion and development of opportunities for older workers to participate in retirement planning programs.

With this commitment in mind, the UAW began in 1957 to seek help from the University of Michigan and the University of Chicago to develop materials and to train its own staff to conduct pre-retirement education programs.

In 1958, the UAW asked at the bargaining table for joint programs but, because it was a bad year in the auto industry, the issue was shoved aside. The union then took a staff member from each region—18 in all—and trained them in concepts and techniques of discussion leadership at the University of Chicago. This was followed up by leadership training workshops in practically all the union's summer schools, where local leaders also were exposed to the content and method of the program.

Some local unions actually conducted their own programs following this summer school training, but it was found that a certain amount of full-time staff coordination and leadership was necessary to get the program started and to keep it going at the local union level. Since 1958, dozens of local union pre-retirement programs have been conducted and thousands of older UAW members have been exposed to the basic idea of planning for retirement. Participation has been excellent in these programs even though they were carried on at night on the workers' and instructors' own time.

In 1961, pre-retirement education again was on the bargaining table. This time it was referred to the "Joint study committees" which were set up to deal with problems of a continuing nature that were not resolved in bargaining.

One such committee at the Scovill Manufacturing Company in Waterbury, Connecticut, took up the matter of pre-retirement education at the initiative of Ralph Daddesio, President of UAW Local 1604. The company representatives on the committee expressed genuine interest in the proposal and asked the UAW to explain what it had been doing



brought sufficient pressure to bear on Premier Ky and the nine other ruling generals to hold an election in the thick of a war for survival.

The decision pulled the rug from under Thich Tri Quang's ominously gathering revolution and relegated him to a political position as weak as his present physical condition. The leader of the militant Mahayana form of Buddhism is near death from a hunger strike in a Saigon hospital.

The decision to allow a vote produced the first real combing this country has had since its troubles with the Viet Cong and North Viet Nam began. Government teams obtained what amounts to the first comprehensive census, the first clear line on where the people stood and what they were thinking about, the first spelling out of what they hoped for in the way of a new constitution. In the combing process, many Viet Cong were unearthed, and many defected.

The election—and those which are now certain to follow—will be the most effective means yet devised to clamp down on Viet Nam's traditional corruption in high places. The proliferation of politicians dependent on the public vote will mean that the public will have better surveillance of their activities and thus a more restraining influence on their banditry.

It is dangerous to run for office in Viet Nam. Virtually every man and woman who announced for a seat in the Constitutional Assembly was subjected to open or covert threats from the VC, who are distressingly omnipresent. It takes real courage to vote, too, particularly in the remoter regions, where it is worth a person's life to call a cop for protection.

But hundreds ran for office and millions voted, and the feeling here is that great chains dropped from these bent backs. The people of South Viet Nam walk a bit taller today. They have engaged in an exercise that makes them one with their great good friend, the United States. They feel they are now on their way to duplicate the political solidity which South Korea has found after the brutal occupation, brazen war and the iron rule of old Syngman Rhee. They feel, too, that the economic miracle that struck Japan after its people got the vote might even be duplicated here.

Americans have been urging successive Saigon governments for years to gear up an election machine. We would never demand it. Actually, we possess much less control over these people than critics at home and abroad discredit us with. As George Patton once observed, when asked what it was like to run an army, it's like trying to push a string of spaghetti uphill. It's easier to pull it up.

It would have been easier to grab the ruling Vietnamese generals by their breast-medals and tell them how we want things run, but it just isn't done that way. You just keep prodding the spaghetti and finally, almost incomprehensively, it makes it to the summit.

The American diplomats and military brass here have done a remarkable job of keeping their hands off the political picture. When a top man here was asked today if he would comment on the way Premier Ky is running the government—he approves heartily of Ky, by the way—he looked aghast. "I wouldn't think of expressing my high regard for him," he said. "Ky could die in the clutches of my embrace. He'd be bombarded with charges of being our puppet.

"Let's put it this way: For his own good, I'll never become a member of the Ky Club." which, of course, he's not."

## Motion Picture Code of Self-Regulation

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the September 21, 1966, Washington Post concerning the code of self-regulation adopted September 20 by the Motion Picture Association of America.

The motion picture industry occupies a unique and important position in our society and in our economy for the products of the industry have a profound impact on our Nation and its citizens.

It has therefore been generally recognized that attention was needed to the matter of updating the standards for motion picture production and advertising.

I sincerely hope that the new code of self-regulation, with the full cooperation of the industry and the public, may have meaningful results in the area of providing fair and reasonable guidelines for the production and showing of movies. The article follows:

#### FILMS AND FREEDOM

The Motion Picture Association of America announces today a new code of self-regulation for the film production industry. For a decade the principle movie-makers of the country have operated under a production code which gave rather extravagant lip service to Victorian proprieties and had a steadily diminishing relation to the realities of contemporary taste and artistic expression. Jack Valenti, the new president of the MPA, seems to have made it his first order of business to modernize the code and give it effective meaning. He deserves congratulations on the accomplishment.

One need only look at the movie section of any daily newspaper to see that there is a good deal of pandering to prurience and vulgarity in the current bill of fare; no doubt this is a shrewd response to what a considerable part of the public wants. But there is also a great deal of first-rate entertainment and a quantity of extremely interesting experimentation in motion picture themes, techniques and forms of expression. The movies can have freedom to flourish as an art only if they have a considerable measure of freedom at the same time to shock, disgust and even outrage a portion of the public.

The movie-makers have sought to preserve their freedom by embracing a measure of self-regulation—a traditional American approach. Their new code seeks "to assure that the freedom which encourages the artist remains responsible and sensitive to the standards of the larger society." It differs from the old code in two respects. First, it refrains from treating any subject as taboo, focusing its regulation instead on the treatment accorded to the subject. Second, it embraces a classification system for films, candidly announcing to the public that some products are designed for adult audiences only.

The standards for film treatment of subjects in the new code are, perhaps necessarily,

vague and pious. They provide, for example, that "evil, sin, crime and wrong-doing shall not be justified." That can mean anything or nothing, of course. Propriety being a matter of taste, there are bound to be differences of opinion concerning it. We shall have to see how the new code is administered.

We think voluntary classification is a good idea—a much better idea than the mandatory and official classification instituted by law in Dallas and recently approved there by a decision of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. There are pictures of interest to adults which some of those adults do not wish their children to see.

The MPA proposes to have such films identified as "suggested for mature audiences." It does not propose, as the Dallas ordinance does, to have the classification made by a board of censors or to penalize exhibitors who allow juveniles to attend. It puts the responsibility for protecting children where it belongs—on their parents. And it gives parents the notification necessary for them to exercise their supervisory role intelligently. That is about as much as can be done without incurring the evils of censorship.

The new code affords a hopeful augury that the motion picture industry is definitely coming of age. Unfettered, it has a prodigious potential both as art and as entertainment.

## Freedom of Choice?

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Tommy Turner for the September 14 edition of the Dallas Morning News concerning the school district in Groesbeck, Tex. Apparently it is rather hard for some of our Federal employees to understand the meaning of "freedom of choice."

#### FREEDOM OF CHOICE: GROESBECK SCHOOL CHALLENGES HEW

(By Thomas E. Turner)

GROESBECK, TEXAS.—The Groesbeck school board figures that some government people in Washington don't know the meaning of the word "freedom."

Or the legal differences between desegregation and integration.

Groesbeck's school system is calling what it considers the bluff of the powerful U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, whose approval of integration plans is necessary in order for a school district to get federal money.

Last year the school system desegregated. That is, it passed the required "freedom of choice" rules, and saw to it that everybody concerned knew about it. The city's 300-plus Negro students remained in their school.

About three weeks ago, shortly before the start of the fall semester, six men from HEW in Washington called on Groesbeck. They wanted to know why it wasn't integrated. And they said if it didn't do so this year it would lose every dime of federal money.

Groesbeck schoolmen told the investigators the Negro students are still in their usual

school because they exercised their complete freedom-of-choice and stayed there.

The visitors said a "dual school, system" cannot be legal, voluntary or not.

They said that the government would be satisfied to begin with, if the Groesbeck schools closed the first two grades in the Negro elementary school and moved the children into the white school.

Groesbeck says that is coercion in reverse—forcing the students to attend a school they don't want to—and has refused to go along despite the threat of losing much of its income.

School Supt. H. O. Whitehurst stresses that the Groesbeck pupils have a complete "freedom of choice" in all grades, not just a "stair-step" or token plan. The white high school this year has a Negro teacher, and there is a white teacher in the Negro school.

To determine whether Negro students have been intimidated away from integration, the team of HEW men spent three days in a door-to-door canvass of Negro homes. If they found a single instance of intimidation the school system hasn't heard about it.

Groesbeck's peppery elementary principal, James Caudle, a longtime critic of forced integration, says he believes that the HEW is squirming a trifle uncomfortably over the Groesbeck situation—especially in view of a recent federal court ruling in Georgia that a school board can't force Negroes to attend a white school.

"That's exactly the situation here," says Caudle. "It isn't a question of opposing desegregation, or being too slow with it. We are completely desegregated, period. That's all a federal court could order us to do, and we've already done it. We've given every student freedom of choice, as the law demands. And they're exercising it. They're not just doing it exactly as some of those Washington people would like."

Groesbeck Journal editor Jack Hawkins, a state representative and former State Board of Education member, produced a caustic editorial during the visit of the HEW investigators. He asserted that they "had their minds made up even before they hit the city limits . . . even before they left Washington."

They can't understand, says Hawkins, that Negro students can prefer the fine school "that mother and father and big sister and brother went to . . ." Hawkins says he believes some federal officials zealously pushed the big new financial "aid to schools" program as a sneaky way to gain control of the educational system.

### Campaigns Cost Too Much

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body knows how expensive it is for him to retain his seat in the Congress. It is appalling that some candidates feel they can be elected to public office only because they have available to them enormous amounts of money. Unfortunately they have some reason to believe this to be true.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial on this matter which appeared in the September 14, 1966, edition of the New York World Journal Tribune:

#### CAMPAIGNS COST TOO MUCH

Frank O'Connor has joined Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. in calling for an agreed ceiling on campaign expenses. It is easy to be cynical about these appeals. Mr. Roosevelt, with many Liberals disaffected, including the chief paymaster of the party, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, is sure to find it difficult to raise funds. The Democrats are far from poverty-stricken, but they have already made an issue of Governor Rockefeller's wealth. Both O'Connor and Roosevelt, therefore, are not disinterested. But neither is the public.

Quite apart from the present campaign, the huge cost of conducting a modern political contest and the lack of clear legal or ethical guidelines on how to meet them are posing an increasingly difficult problem for Americans.

The drift toward choosing candidates who are wealthy in their own right has been pronounced; the difficulty of getting men of average means to run for office is becoming more and more evident. This does not mean that American politics has to revert to the day when every candidate had to prove he was born in a log cabin or a slum to be acceptable—but neither does it mean that this country should be represented in political office solely by men of means.

The problem is a very complex one, involving as it does the need for regulating both the source of campaign funds and their expenditure; the disparity between the publicity avenues open to an incumbent and to a new man in politics; the ratio between purchased advertising and the gratuitous support of various organizations. To draw up a law governing all the ponderable and imponderable influences which affect a candidate's political fortunes would be difficult, if not impossible.

But surely a beginning can and should be made toward making political office more palatable for those candidates who do not have ready access to lots and lots of money—either their own or that of their friends, or of those who hope to be friendly with a successful office-seeker.

An over-all ceiling on cash outlays in behalf of a candidate would be such a beginning. It should be tried, by agreement, during the present state campaign, and codified into law as soon as the Legislature can get around to it. We want the best men for office in this country—not just those who have, or can attract, large sums of cash.

### They Won't Let You Vote

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1966

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, following last week's primary election in Maryland there have been numerous letters to the editor, articles, and editorials criticizing certain aspects of the election process. I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial on the subject by Kenneth T. MacDonald, general manager of WJZ-TV, in Baltimore:

#### THEY WON'T LET YOU VOTE

(Presented by Kenneth T. MacDonald, general manager, WJZ-TV, Baltimore, Md., September 15, 1966)

Sometimes it seems as if the laws and customs that govern elections in this country

were designed to keep people from voting. The small turnout of 40 to 60 percent in American elections is often compared unfavorably with other Western Democracies which regularly draw 90 percent of their registered voters to the polls. Perhaps, however, the problem is not American apathy, but the difficult conditions under which Americans are forced to vote.

Take Maryland's recent primary election as an example. It took place on a busy working day in the middle of the week. The citizen who works and still wants to vote must either get up at the crack of dawn, or skip lunch, or rush home from work and stand in line during his normal dinner hour. In many cases the line is long and out-of-doors. If, as in the case of Tuesday's primary, it happens to be raining hard, getting soaked is part of the price of voting. Sometimes if the polling place is a school, the line is indoors, but in this case the voter finds all the available parking space taken up by the teachers in the school. And, incidentally, the voting jam also disrupts the routine of the school.

How do other countries do it so as to bring out 90 per cent or more of the electorate? The most important difference from the American practice is that elections are held on Sunday, or election day is a legal holiday. This gives every citizen time to vote—in fact it makes voting his primary responsibility for that day.

There are many other problems connected with elections such as, in Maryland, loose and inadequate election laws, ballots with too many names, and politically controlled elections boards. WJZ-TV will discuss these in subsequent editorials.

The most immediate problem is providing adequate time for the people to vote. The solution to this and other election problems must be found through both State and Federal action. This makes it an ideal campaign issue between now and the general election. It is bad enough when people don't bother to vote, but it is much worse when they want to vote and conditions curtail their opportunity.

### Williston Park Proclaims U.N. Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in this time of international conflict, economic depression and development, and political reevaluation of national policies throughout the world, the need for an effective world organization has become increasingly evident. The United Nations stands as a forum where the nations of the world can strive to solve their mutual problems, to resolve their conflicts, to insure world peace, and to work together for the benefit of all mankind. This proclamation by Mayor Fay of Williston Park from the Williston Times, of Long Island, N.Y., September 21, 1966, demonstrates one community's observance of United Nations Day, October 24, which should serve as a model for all the citizens of the world's nations.

The proclamation follows:

#### PROCLAMATION

Whereas twenty-one years ago, on October twenty-fourth 1945, the United Nations Charter came into force; and

A4892

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 21, 1966

on world issues in which Russia takes an opposite viewpoint the universal status of the United States is weakened.

Just as there are times when compromises are in order, there also are many times when no compromise should be made. Letting the Soviet Union off the U.N. hook regarding its big IOU will encourage like debtors into leaving the U.S. holding the bag. And this country already is footing too many bills around the world.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, May 6, 1966]

ATTA BOY—WAYNE HAYS BRINGS NEEDED FRANK TALK TO DIPLOMATIC WORLD

WAYNE L. HAYS, the outspoken Congressman from Ohio's Eighteenth District, took off the verbal gloves the other day during a session of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg, France.

HAYS, who headed a four-member congressional delegation to this semi-annual parliamentary get-together, took advantage of the opportunity to get something off his chest respecting French President De Gaulle's NATO antics. Breaking through the camouflage of diplomatic double talk, he asked his hearers who needs enemies with friends like the French around.

Understandably outraged, diplomatically proper Edmond Nessler, a member of the French Assembly, promptly characterized Hays' remarks as "impolite, anti-European, aggressive and caricature of French policy." Another member of the French delegation suggested that HAYS had exceeded his privileges as a guest of the Assembly, adding that the American had been singularly insolent, but that perhaps different views of international courtesy are entertained on different sides of the Atlantic.

Nothing daunted, Hays disclaimed any purpose of giving offense, but emphasized that he just wanted to bring things out into the open and have the facts viewed as they are.

"I was," he said, "trying to convey to this body and to the France what is happening to public opinion in the United States vis-a-vis France. It was a candid appraisal of an eroding of the great reservoir of good will which the French had in the United States. If you think anything I said was harsh you should hear some of the comments of the man in the street, who only a few years ago was talking the other way about France. This is something about which you may be sensitive, but it is something about which you ought to know."

This newspaper never has succeeded in working up much indignation over DeGaulle's performance because it is disposed to applaud rather than decry nationalism and independence wherever they appear, and because we feel that the less responsibility we have for the defense of Europe or any Country of Europe the better off we will be. But giving him the benefit of every consideration, DeGaulle is a difficult man to love. That he has, as HAYS so forcibly told his official representatives at Strasbourg, undermined much of the historic good will Americans have held for France, there can be no doubt.

For what this is worth to them, it is something, as HAYS says, the French should know about. They never would know it were the niceties of diplomatic exchange relied upon to get the knowledge over to them. So we say bully for WAYNE! A little more of this rough-and-tumble talk from the realm of the striped pants boys might do the art of diplomacy, and the cause of international understanding, a world of good.

UN  
Red Aid to Vietnam

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly efforts are made on the part of administration spokesmen to downplay the part the U.S.S.R. and other Eastern European Communist countries are playing in the shipment of goods to North Vietnam.

These nations, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R. are actually shipping significant amounts of equipment and supplies to North Vietnam. Undoubtedly this aid is helping the North Vietnamese very much in their aggression against South Vietnam.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the Record a recent news column by Dumitru Danielopol which appeared in the September 12, 1966; San Diego Union, discussing the aid which is going to North Vietnam from these countries.

The column follows:

BULGARIA BOASTS OF AID TO NORTH VIETNAMESE

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Russia and all her satellite nations are effectively helping the North Vietnamese kill our GIs.

The Reds make no secret of it. In fact, they boast about it.

The help rendered North Viet Nam by Russia and her satellites is being constantly increased.

This was emphasized in the recent statement signed by Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and the U.S.S.R. at a Warsaw Pact meeting.

"We are rendering, and will go on giving the DRV (North Viet Nam) ever increasing moral-political support and every kind of assistance, including economic help and assistance with means of defense, materials, equipment and specialists, needed to repulse the American aggression victoriously," the statement said.

They promised to send "volunteers" whenever North Viet Nam asked for them.

This is no empty promise.

The Bulgarian newspaper Fogled recently gave a detailed account of the kind of help Bulgaria is giving Viet Nam.

Despite the hardships caused by American bombing near Haiphong, it said, Bulgarian ships continue to bring supplies.

"The Bulgarian ship Georgi Benkovski recently brought sugar from Cuba into the Port of Haiphong," it boasted. "The Bulgarian Red Cross sent vast quantities of medicines, medical instruments, bandages bedding and clothing."

Money for this is being collected in Bulgaria directly or through the sale of special "Aid for Viet Nam" stamps.

Bulgaria is also sending electric trucks, steam boilers, hydraulic pumps, cables, spare parts, insulators, etc.

It also has undertaken to construct and equip transformer posts, refrigerators, canning factories and engineering workshops.

In accordance with the agreement signed earlier this year part of it is given free of cost and the rest on long term credits.

Similar agreements have been signed with North Viet Nam by Russia and the other satellites.

Bulgarian exports to Hanoi, the paper said, have increased 25 per cent over last year.

"Enterprises all over the country," it said, "are completing their orders to Viet Nam ahead of schedule."

The Communist boss in Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, also is stepping up help to North Viet Nam.

He says his government is taking "appropriate steps to increase the material, political and moral support given to the Vietnamese people until the U.S. aggressors are completely smashed."

## Cities Begin To Think Federal Aid To Build Sewer, Water Systems Isn't Any "Bargain"

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, last year we enacted new water pollution control legislation and had high hopes that this extremely vital program would begin immediately to show some accomplishment and some achievement in our battle to preserve the usable water supplies of this Nation. Unfortunately, the problem has lagged. Some blame a lack of funds and others blame the division of authority between various agencies of Government. Whatever is wrong, we cannot tolerate much delay. We are very late in starting this program and every moment lost means more serious water problems for the cities of our Nation in the future.

Writing in the Wall Street Journal, Neil Ulman has summarized some of the problems and I believe his findings and comments should be of interest to all. I include the Ulman article with my remarks as follows:

CITIES BEGIN TO THINK FEDERAL AID TO BUILD SEWER, WATER SYSTEMS ISN'T ANY "BARGAIN"

(By Neil Ulman)

Cities and towns that have lined up with their hands out for Government aid in constructing sewer and water projects are beginning to think that Federal funds aren't the "bargain" they're cracked up to be.

The demand for 50% grants under various Government programs far outstrips the available funds, with the result that many municipalities' chances of getting any aid are slim. In addition, those towns that have been told they're in line to receive Federal help with their projects can expect to wait months or even years before they receive any funds.

Although Congress has appropriated \$100 million to be granted this year under just one program, that of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, requests for this aid from thousands of communities totaled about \$3 billion as of August.

FUTILITY OF THE HOPES

The futility of the hopes of receiving Federal money, at least for many communities, means that taxpayers in those towns going

September 21, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4891

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations has called for the annual observance of October twenty-fourth as United Nations Day, to be celebrated by all Member Nations; and

Whereas the citizens of this community are fully aware that our survival requires worldwide cooperation; and that this country's highest hopes are in harmony with the hopes and aspirations of people everywhere; and

Whereas the United Nations was created to maintain peace in the world, based on respect for the principle of equal rights, and to raise the standard of living for all men—purposes which the United States of America wholeheartedly supports; and

Whereas the United Nations is the only international forum where nations large and small can gather together in their common belief that the conference table is better than the battle field; and

Whereas the United Nations and its family of agencies has earned the esteem and respect of the citizens of this country and of this city for its practical achievements, which directly benefit each one of us in our daily lives, and help us to fulfill the humanitarian obligations which Americans have always tried to serve; and

Whereas the success of the United Nations depends to a great extent on the good will and support of a well-informed public:

Now therefore, I, Roger F. Fay Mayor of Williston Park do hereby proclaim Monday, October 24, 1966 as United Nations Day, and call upon all citizens of Williston Park to observe that day in a spirit of common purpose with the aims of the United Nations; I urge everyone, groups or individuals, to participate in programs and activities designed to give support and encouragement to effective U.S. participation in the United Nations. I ask all citizens to observe United Nations Day with a sense of rededication to the high truths which we in the United States hold to be self-evident, as expressed for us in the Constitution of the United States and for all the world in the Charter of the United Nations.

Attest:

CLYDE FERRO, Sr.  
Village Clerk.

## The Nation Needs Wayne L. Hays

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 21, 1966

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am quite proud of my subcommittee chairmen and want to especially commend Chairman WAYNE L. HAYS, of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations, for the outstanding job that he and his subcommittee did in handling the legislation before them this session.

I am including with these remarks, Mr. Speaker, editorials from the Wall Street Journal of June 22, 1962; the Lorain, Ohio, Journal, which is not in Congressman Hays' district, of May 9, 1962; his local paper, the Times Leader of March 30, 1962; the Dover, Ohio, Daily Reporter of September 17, 1965; and the Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer of May 6, 1966. The Tenor of all of these is the same and

that is that Congress needs more people like WAYNE L. HAYS.

The editorials follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 22, 1962]

#### THE GIMLET EYE OF MR. HAYS

We were sorry to see the State Department walk up Capitol Hill with requests for a \$300,000 home for the U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus and a \$1,370,000 apartment building for U.S. diplomats in Japan. Because it just got itself kicked unceremoniously down again by Representative WAYNE HAYS, Ohio Democrat, and chairman of a House subcommittee which passes on oversea construction for U.S. diplomats.

Of the Cyprus project, Mr. HAYS said: "Even Billie Sol Estes only lives in a \$150,000 house." And: "There are only 587,000 people on the whole island." Of the apartment proposal, he said: "You are going to get that over my dead body." He added that there has to be an end someplace to sending innumerable people to Japan and that this is a good place to start.

The upshot of the Department's collision with the Congressman from Ohio is that the figures for both projects will be reworked without, one supposes, doing U.S. diplomacy irreparable harm.

The taxpayer watching this exchange can't help wondering what would happen to Federal expenditures generally if every congressional committee had on it just one gimlet-eyed Hays.

[From the Lorain (Ohio) Journal, May 9, 1962]

#### AN OHIOAN PROTESTS

One Congressman who speaks out bluntly against some of the ridiculously wasteful practices of the foreign aid program is an Ohioan, Representative WAYNE L. HAYS.

Congressman Hays, whose home is at Flushing, Ohio, represents the 18th District, comprised of Belmont, Carroll, Columbiana, Harrison, and Jefferson Counties (together with Monroe, Noble, and Tuscarawas Counties added and less Carrol County lost in 1966). He is a Democrat. He was first elected to the 81st Congress in 1948, and has been reelected in succeeding terms.

Just for the record, it is briefly mentioned that Mr. Hays has a solid background. He is a college graduate, a former teacher of history, was mayor of Flushing for three terms, volunteered for military service in World War II, served a term in the Ohio Senate, and served as a county commissioner in Belmont County.

In other words, he has adequate educational qualifications and extensive political experience.

Obviously, Representative Hays can speak with as much authority about some of the flaws of foreign aid as various other Congressmen, bemused with the theory of giving away money to win friends can speak of its merits.

About a week ago Mr. Hays declared in a protest to foreign aid officials that American taxpayers are footing the bill for \$3,000-a-month Cabinet members in the Congo.

Foreign aid spokesmen offered the usual argument, this being that the funds being supplied by the United States to the Congolese are not the same funds from which the Cabinet members are drawing their exorbitant salaries.

HAYS replied with biting logic that if the Congolese had to pay for the food and other expenses met by U.S. funds, that the officials wouldn't have money available for their fabulous salaries.

Don't give me that old argument that it isn't this money," said Congressman HAYS. "That is the argument Trujillo used when we gave him \$600,000 in 1 year and he gave his son a \$600,000 allowance. He said it wasn't the same money."

What HAYS said is clear enough, to an ordinary citizen or to a schoolboy. Unfortunately, it does not seem very clear to many other Members of Congress and not clear at all to the foreign aid officials who keep dishing out the money—our money—to other countries. As long as we keep giving, the recipients will remain needy and greedy.

The question is, How can Congressman Hays retain his clear vision in the Washington atmosphere that seems to becloud the eyes of many of his compatriots on the foreign aid issue?

Whatever the answer to that question may be, Mr. HAYS deserves encouragement from all parts of the State and Nation to continue to fight against foreign aid wastefulness.

Letters addressed to Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, House Office Building, Washington, D.C., will reach him.

[From the Times Leader, Mar. 30, 1962]

#### CONGRATULATIONS DUE HAYS

We wish to commend Congressman WAYNE L. HAYS for voting against President Kennedy's tax bill.

While there are many of the facets of the bill we don't like—probably more than those with which Mr. HAYS takes exception—that is not the case in point.

It must have been pretty tough for the Flushing Congressman to go against the wishes of his fellow Democrats, even the President, and the fact that he did follow his own convictions demonstrates he has the courage to represent his district to the best of his ability. And it has been our observation that he has always tried to do just that.

We need more Representatives in Washington who put the real interests of the people above political expediency and personal ambition.

[From the Dover (Ohio) Daily Reporter, Sept. 17, 1965]

#### CHEERS FOR REPRESENTATIVE HAYS

U.S. Rep. WAYNE L. HAYS (D-Flushing) had some well-worded advice for U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg.

It was expressed by the Ohio congressman in a letter to Rep. THOMAS F. MORGAN (D-Pa.), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Rep. HAYS informed Cong. MORGAN he would not serve on the U.S. delegation to next week's session of the United Nations Assembly.

Rep. HAYS, who is chairman of the House foreign affairs subcommittee on State Department personnel, told Rep. MORGAN: "As a member of the legislative branch, I would not feel right in having my speeches written or censored by Ambassador Goldberg, or any other member of the executive branch."

The congressman said the ambassador's explanation before the House Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. backdown on Article 19 of the U.N. charter "had the effect of excusing the Soviet Union of making any payments to the U.N. except those it wants to make."

Then came the advice: "I sincerely hope the new ambassador will learn before too much longer what seems to have escaped him in his service as a labor lawyer and justice of the Supreme Court, and that is that the representatives of the Soviet Union operate on the theory that what is theirs is theirs, and what is ours is negotiable. If the new ambassador is to effectively serve the interest of the United States, he will have to quickly learn that true compromise, and I believe in compromise, involves more than a one-way street."

The people of America certainly will concur with Representative HAYS' statement in respect to the Soviet Union's attitude that it does no wrong and that the United States must kow-tow to whatever position it assumes. Each time this country backs down