

objection to the requests of the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from New York?

The Chair hears none, and the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRAFFIN] will be added to the cloture motion.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] be allowed to sign the cloture motion.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on the minimum wage bill conference report on Wednesday, the vote on the motion for cloture shall take place immediately.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may not object, but I understand the rules set for a time for the vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is why I asked unanimous consent.

Mr. STENNIS. Is this the time specified?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. That is why I asked unanimous consent. Otherwise, it would be automatic. I thought it would be best for the convenience of all Senators concerned.

Mr. STENNIS. The request is merely for the convenience of Senators?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly.

Mr. STENNIS. And has nothing to do with the procedure on cloture itself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not in the least. It would make it convenient for Senators.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I hope I shall not find it necessary to object—if we should have an opportunity to vote on the motion to take up before that time, would we nevertheless be required to vote in accordance with the unanimous consent request? Could we vote on the motion to proceed prior to that time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not quite understand.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Suppose we should vote on the motion to proceed between now and Wednesday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no vote on the motion to proceed between now and the time of the vote on the cloture motion; I can assure the Senator of that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The majority leader can assure the Senate that there will be no vote on that matter between now and then?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can, and I do.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, can the majority leader be specific on the time of the vote?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Approximately 6 o'clock.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I inquire of the majority leader whether, if the conference report be rejected, it will then be in order to make motions and perhaps have votes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, again reserving the right to object, as I understand the majority leader, assurance is given to the Senate that his request is based merely on the convenience of Senators, and that no motion will be made or in order, and the majority leader will actively oppose any motion to dispose of the bill, or the motion to take up, or any other questions with reference to the House bill which is now the pending business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has my word.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

THE VIETNAM ELECTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the election of a constituent assembly to draft a constitution for Vietnam is an event of surpassing importance.

That it should have taken place under reasonably tranquil conditions and with no more untoward incidents than one might find in an election in New York or Chicago is in itself of the highest significance.

Anyone familiar with Vietnam, with the stress and strain of the instant struggle and with the high illiteracy rate must realize how impressive this vote by the people really is. Anyone familiar with the group cleavages—the religious and ideological pressures in Vietnam—will appreciate the feelings of the Vietnamese people.

Behind the stolid expression which characterizes their oriental outlook on life; behind the seeming indifference which would be rather easy to understand; behind the factional pushing and pulling of recent years is a purposeful determination to manage their own destiny, and surely this is in the best democratic tradition.

The response of the people is one of the most impressive facets of that election. It may well exceed 75 percent or more of the eligible voters who responded. Could we have done better?

We are equipped with up-to-the-minute views on all matters by an alert press, by a radio and television medium which is as up to the minute as the restaurant prices in a nation beset with wild inflation. We might be expected to know the last word on an election of this kind, but for the Vietnamese with limited communications, low literacy, an overriding fear of the constant Vietcong surveillance makes this an extraordinary record.

For us it as a tonic. It is an answer to those who believe that our faith in the Vietnamese and in their desire for self-determination has been fully vindicated.

In the welter of war and bereavement, the people of Vietnam have demonstrated their determination to be free. They have proved to all the world that, notwithstanding numberless handicaps,

they have not lost sight of their national goals, and that is the desire to remain the masters of their own freedom and their own destiny without pressure from without.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the civil rights bill is disposed of this week by means of cloture or a failure of cloture, it is the hope of the distinguished minority leader and myself that, if the committees start functioning with reasonable dispatch as they can and will, we can dispose of the legislation still pending in committees before or by October 15.

We have discussed this matter and we would both very much like to adjourn by October 15, and not recess.

The decision, however, is not in our hands. It is in the hands of the committees, and I personally appeal to the chairmen of the committees and to the ranking minority members to do what they can to expedite the handling of this legislation so that it may be possible for the Senate and Congress to adjourn sine die by October 15 of this year.

The minority leader and I have also discussed the possibility of meetings on Saturday. We hope that the Senate would occur in this procedure if there is legislation to consider in an effort to reach adjournment by October 15.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concur in the hope expressed by the distinguished majority leader.

I assure him now that, insofar as the minority is concerned, we will cooperate with respect to Saturday sessions. I think it is appropriate here and now to thank the majority leader for his generosity and tolerance all through this session. We have had few if any Saturday sessions that I recall.

That is not much of a sacrifice for Senators to make if there is a reasonable hope that we can conclude our legislative labors by the 15th of October.

Mr. President, I shall propose when our policy committee meets tomorrow—and that will include all of our members—that we explore this matter.

I am confident there will be a maximum amount of cooperation afforded in order to achieve this goal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express my thanks to the distinguished minority leader and state that if there are Saturday sessions, it will only be because there is business to be attended to and not merely for the purpose of meeting on Saturday per se.

VIETNAM'S WAGER ON DEMOCRACY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, there has been a great deal said in this Chamber about American actions in southeast Asia. There has been too little said about the brave people of South Vietnam.

On Sunday the citizens of that country went to the polls to elect a constituent assembly which would decide how their Republic is to be governed. To prevent them from conducting this basic sacra-

were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:
Address by Deputy Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen delivered at the dedication of the U.S. Post Office and Federal Building, Parsons, W. Va.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate have a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements limited to 3 minutes, and that the unfinished business not be displaced.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for term expiring June 22, 1968.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in confirming the nomination of John A. Carver, Jr., as a member of the Federal Power Commission, be rescinded, and that that nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar and passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be reconsidered and placed on the calendar.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams to be a general on the retired list.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Allen M. Shinn to be a vice admiral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl Walske, of New Mexico, to be Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13712, THE MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, September 14, 1966, during the further consideration of H.R. 13712, the conference report on the minimum wage bill, debate shall commence at 3 p.m. on the question of agreeing to the conference report, and shall be limited to not more than 3 hours on that question, the time to be equally divided between and controlled by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], or whomever they may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the previous unanimous-consent request concerning the conference report on the minimum wage bill, so that, instead of the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] being in charge of the opposition, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be assigned that task.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order will be so modified. The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That beginning at 3 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday, September 14, 1966, during the further consideration of H.R. 13712, the conference report on the minimum wage bill, debate on the adoption of the conference report shall be limited not to exceed 3 hours with the time to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Ordered further, That immediately following the disposition of the conference report on H.R. 13712, the minimum wage bill, instead of the time prescribed by rule XXII, the Senate shall proceed to vote on the cloture motion to bring to a close the debate on the motion to take up H.R. 14765, to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

MOTION FOR CLOTURE ON CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion for cloture, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the motion to proceed for the consideration of H.R. 14765, an act to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

MIKE MANSFIELD, PHILIP A. HART, GAYLORD NELSON, THOMAS J. DODD, HENRY M. JACKSON, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, BIRCH BAYH, DANIEL K. INOUE, WAYNE MORSE, E. J. MCCARTHY, EDWARD KENNEDY, JOSEPH TYDINGS, J. K. JAVITS, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, HIRAM L. FONG, HUGH SCOTT.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, because a 10-minute delay made it impossible for me to be here in time to affix my name to the cloture motion on civil rights, that I may, at this time, affix my name to that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield, I should like to make a similar unanimous-consent request, that the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] be affixed to the cloture motion, who came into the Chamber about 1 minute after the motion was read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

ment of democracy, the Communist Vietcong intensified their campaign of terror, striking at villages, at military outposts, and deep into the capital of Saigon, itself. They sought to frighten the innocent Vietnamese into staying away from the polls. To date this savagery has left 19 dead and 120 wounded. In the Mekong Delta alone, 52 incidents of terror were reported on election day. Over 140 were counted throughout the country.

Despite this brutal campaign of intimidation, over 4 million people went to the polls—a turnout of better than 75 percent of the registered voters, and a rate of ballot participation far higher than anyone had dared to hope. This is an extraordinary demonstration by a poor and humble people of their courageous devotion to the cause of self-government.

The world does not yet know what decision the voters will produce. But it does know that the people of Vietnam have given the lie to the Communist argument that the Vietcong and their terror represent the wave of the future. They have also shown that there are weapons more potent than raw force.

In Venezuela and the Dominican Republic, we have recently witnessed the triumph of the democratic system of elections over Communist violence and terror. The instruments of democracy are the strongest weapons available to man. They are a match for subversion, conspiracy, tyranny and terror. We sometimes fail to appreciate the true measure of their power.

The Vietcong may well have suffered their Dienbienphu—at the polls.

At every reasonable opportunity, the instrument of suffrage, and of public debate and public expression, should all be used as this experiment in democracy gains strength.

If man is to achieve his dream of peace on earth, his words and his will must overcome the fist and the dagger. Albert Camus wrote:

Henceforth the sole honor will be to hold obstinately to the tremendous wager which will finally decide if words are stronger than bullets.

Yesterday's action by the Vietnamese people strengthens our faith that the wager is being won.

THE VIETNAMESE ELECTION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, yesterday the embattled citizens of Vietnam answered a question that has been the subject of world dispute for many many months.

Spokesmen by the dozens, purporting to represent the tens of thousands of Vietnamese, have been declaring over many months that these people did not understand nor comprehend the meaning of democracy.

Sunday the Vietnamese people, millions strong, spoke for themselves.

Instead of a stay-at-home vote—instead of ignoring the opportunity to express themselves—they spoke in the 80-percent turnout of the registered voters of their desire to be their own masters.

This was a decision that they want to walk down the road of representative,

constitutional government. They thus embarked upon the first step toward self-government in selecting the delegates to draft the necessary constitution for self-government.

Loud and clear they said that they want nothing to do with Ho Chi Minh and his Communist agents and followers in the south.

They gave the lie to the idea that the Vietcong represented any significant part of the Vietnamese people.

Confounding many of the so-called experts, these Vietnamese people declared that they want freedom and democratic institutions and a chance to pick their own representatives.

In no uncertain terms, Mr. President, this message was given for the world to hear. And I hope that all Americans and the people of every nation—and particularly the leaders in Hanoi—have heard and understood that message.

All Americans can take heart from this massive expression of free popular will of the Vietnamese people. For we have been fighting and sacrificing for just this purpose. We consider it of vital importance that these people can make their own way without pressure and intimidation from outside.

Thus, the first step—not a long one, but one of great importance—has been taken toward building a new nation dedicated to the principle of self-rule. Many tough problems lie ahead. The Vietcong, regardless of this defeat at the polls and their efforts to frustrate this election, are not now going to simply melt away.

Ho Chi Minh has suffered an important defeat. But it is doubtful that it is severe enough at this point to make him pull his forces back to the north and to abandon his campaign of terrorism and aggression.

Much hard work and sacrifice remains to be done in Vietnam. Political parties will have to be created. Leaders chosen by the people must prepare to write a constitution to guide a new democracy. Early next year there will be new elections for the executive and legislative institutions that will make up a freely chosen government.

Regardless of our satisfaction over the first strong forward step taken in the election yesterday, it is no time for us—or for the people of Vietnam—to celebrate a victory and consider that the fight is won. It is no time to relax, but a time to rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom.

Instead, those of us who work in the Congress as the constitutional representatives of a great nation of people should once more demonstrate the effectiveness and strength of a government based on the consent of the governed. The bravery and determination of our Vietnamese friends should remind us of our responsibilities of the moment.

The Congress has before it several legislative proposals of great urgency. The pending business of the Senate should be disposed of. Measures to strengthen our domestic economy should be considered without delay.

Meanwhile, the Members of Congress who have overwhelmingly supported three Presidents in our efforts to gain for

the people of Southeast Asia the sacred right of self-determination, can take deep satisfaction from what happened yesterday in Vietnam.

For a courageous and proud people have delivered a message to the world. And the world has heard—and applauded.

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM FOR FISCAL 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of August 25, 1966, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 19789.)

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

LEADING INDICATORS SHOW LONG BUSINESS BOOM ABOUT TO END—PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSALS WOULD MAKE END COME QUICKER AND GO DEEPER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has asked this Congress to suspend the investment credit and endorse the administration's suspension of accelerated depreciation in order to keep prices and interest rates from rising further; that is, to moderate the boom.

Whether Congress should approve the President's proposal depends on how the Members of this Congress expect the economy to behave in the next year and a half or so, if we do not follow the President's prescription, and how we expect it to behave if we do follow it.

Mr. President, I strongly endorse the President's proposed cutbacks in spending, but I hasten to add that he has not gone nearly far enough. I have said he should cut additional spending, and I have indicated how in my judgment he should reduce it.

I favor that course for many reasons. A principal reason is that such a course would have an immediate effect on prices and can be swiftly reversed if we should move into a recession.

But these are exactly the reasons I oppose his tax proposals. Both suspension of the investment credit and postpone-

September 12, 1966

ment of accelerated depreciation will not have their prime effect for a year or more, and their consequences will be felt for years after that time.

This morning's Wall Street Journal carries an excellent article by George Shea which concludes:

Thus the signs accumulate that before many months have passed the course of general business will be seen to be turning down. If so, the tax and other measures urged by President Johnson, if they succeed in slowing down capital spending, will merely add their weight to an already weakening trend.

Mr. Shea spells out the key advance indicators of a turn in our economy which more and more clearly points to the near future as a period when the record long boom of the economy will be turning down. They are:

First. The sharp rise in interest rates—characteristic of the end of a boom period.

Second. A decline in stock prices, following hard on the rise in interest rates. We have suffered a 23-percent drop in stock prices since February.

Third. A third characteristic of the top of booms is that prices of industrial raw materials tend to edge off while other wholesale and most retail prices are still climbing. The Government's daily index of 13 industrial raw materials touched a high just under 125 percent of 1957-59 last March, and in recent days has fallen below 109 percent.

Fourth. Other leading indicators seem to have turned down in recent months. They include housing starts, the average workweek in manufacturing, and commercial and industrial building awards. Still other leading indicators seem to have turned to a level trend from an uptrend previously.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by George Shea from the first page of this morning's Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

The current economic situation in the United States has the earmarks of a typical top in a business boom. If events follow their historical course this top will be followed soon by a downturn in business activity. And the measures just proposed by President Johnson to fight inflation are likely to speed the arrival of the downturn or aggravate it or both.

One of the clearest signs of a boom top is a strong rise in interest rates on borrowed money. Such a rise has been taking place for more than a year.

Some people seem to think the Federal Reserve Board is responsible for the rise in interest rates, and that it triggered the rise when it boosted to 4½ percent from 4 percent last December the discount it charges on loans to member banks. Actually, at that time, rates on tax-free bonds had been rising since early 1965 and rates on Treasury securities had been going up since July.

It is true that the Reserve Board began to ration the banks' lendable reserves as early as the spring of 1965, though it did so far more moderately in that year than it has since March this year. But in spite of such rationing, bank lending has continued at a

very rapid pace. Fundamentally, it is this rapid expansion in loans at the banks, accompanied by large credit demands in other forms, that has tightened money and caused interest rates to rise.

The Reserve authorities themselves put the case clearly in a statement Sept. 1 asking the banks to limit new loans and avoid selling securities as a means of obtaining money to make loans. Credit expansion, they said, "should be moderate enough to help insure that spending—and particularly that financed by bank credit—does not exceed the bounds that can be accommodated by the nation's growing physical resources."

This is the key point in two ways. Not only does spending at a rate of growth beyond that of physical capacity tend to cause prices to rise, thus defeating the efforts of the spenders to speed physical growth. But also, by the same token, the accompanying growth in credit demand tends to exceed the rate of savings growth that the economic system is capable of producing.

In turn, that is why interest rates rise and the supply of credit falls short of demand. As this shortage becomes aggravated it first limits, then often reverses, growth in business activity, bringing about a downturn. Furthermore, the sequence appears inescapable; any attempt by Reserve authorities to increase the supply of credit in this situation would merely speed up inflation of prices without changing the physical limits on growth, and the same unfortunate consequences of tight money and business downturn would follow sooner or later.

Another characteristic of boom tops is a decline in stock prices that follows hard upon rising interest rates. This, too, we have seen in the present instance, with a stock-price drop of some 23 percent since early last February. Basically, the same factors that caused interest rates to go up make stocks go down. People in need of money can't buy stocks and in many cases sell stocks. In addition, of course, low dividend yields obtainable from stocks look less and less attractive when the interest yields available on bonds and other kinds of loans become larger.

A third characteristic of the tops of booms is that prices of industrial raw materials tend to edge off while other wholesale and most retail prices are still climbing. Apparently these raw materials tend to be the first commodities in which supply catches up with demand as a result of the opening up of new sources of production. The Government's daily index of 13 industrial raw materials touched a high just under 125 percent of 1957-59 last March and in recent days has fallen below 109 percent.

This decline may seem strange at a time when the Government and many economists worry about inflation, but such contradictory movements have been seen before. In the 1957-58 recession the index of raw commodities fell from 109.7 in 1956 to 102.2 in 1957 and 95.1 in 1958, although the overall wholesale index in the same years edged up from 96.2 to 99.0 and then to 100.4.

Even in a single commodity, copper, the same thing can be seen today. Since last winter copper scrap has fallen sharply but the U.S. price of newly refined copper was raised last week by two producers; the reason, of course, is that the refiner price has been held artificially far below the world price as reflected in scrap and in the London Metal Market. Now the Administration, continuing the artificial pressure, is trying to persuade the two producers to roll back the price they've raised.

Stock prices and raw material prices are two of the so-called leading indicators that economists watch because they tend to turn up or down ahead of general business. Interest rates are classed as a lagging indicator because they go up late in a boom and down

late in a recession. But in a sense—if looked at upside down, as it were, by watching bond prices—they could be regarded as a very early leading indicator that moves even ahead of stocks and raw materials.

Others of the leading indicators seem to have turned down in recent months. They include housing starts, the average workweek in manufacturing, and commercial and industrial building awards. Still others of these early indicators seem to have turned to a level trend from an uptrend previously.

Thus the signs accumulate that before many months have passed the course of general business will be seen to be turning down. If so, the tax and other measures urged by President Johnson, if they succeed in slowing down capital spending, will merely add their weight to an already weakening trend.

GEORGE SHEA.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on this investment credit suspension, there is a built in technical reason why its effect will be far sharper and greater a year from now than it will be in the first few months.

Consider the position of Transcontinental and Western Airlines, which was reported to have ordered \$400 million of planes on September 2. If the President's proposal is written into law, this firm will lose \$28 million in net profits. If TWA had had any inkling of the Presidential message, they would have speeded up their order to August 31.

Now, Mr. President, consider the position of the businessman next August or September who is considering ordering a big item of equipment. Remember, restoration of this credit will be only 4 or 5 months away. Should he order now or wait 4 or 5 months? With each day that passes, businessmen will be more and more reluctant to order. They will be a day closer to a profitable credit if they wait.

The capital goods industry may start dropping this year, because the credit is absent, but it will accelerate its descent in March, April, May next year. By September, the industry is likely to be all but paralyzed. The last quarter of next year will be a nightmare. Every businessman with any kind of major equipment order in mind will of course postpone the order.

The same will be true of all the industrial building in America. Can one imagine a businessman contracting for a half-billion-dollar plant in October next year, when he could wait 3 months and enjoy a \$35 million increase in his net profit?

So the lag with a specially depressing impact about a year or so from now is a sure consequence of these proposals.

This may mean that Congress will end its suspension earlier. Maybe, maybe not. That depends on what is happening to prices at that time. We could have in late 1967 what the country has had in the past—rapidly increasing unemployment coinciding with continuing rising prices.

Postponement of Government public works projects would involve none of these hazards. Its effect would be swift. Its reversal could come in part or in whole—depending on an instant Presidential decision.

21366

such authority under Article II Section 2 of the Constitution that puts him in charge of the conduct of U.S. foreign relations and his power is not derived from the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. However, I agree that, if such an international agreement is reached and it would result in amending the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921 the consent of Congress would have to be obtained and it would be free to accept or to reject any such amendment.

The question can be legitimately asked by those who are faced with stiff international competition "How do we defend ourselves?"

I submit that the lasting solution to import competition is to increase the efficiency and productivity of the American economy. It is the job of the Federal Government to encourage the growth of the more efficient and competitive elements of this economy through such measures as tax incentives, the reciprocal reduction of trade barriers, revision of antitrust laws, manpower training, aid to higher education, encouraging labor mobility, export promotion.

Much of our economy is highly competitive. A smaller segment is not able to compete against more efficient domestic or foreign competitors.

In the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and in the U.S.-Canada Auto Agreement, Congress recognized the existence of national responsibility should injury to domestic workers or businesses result from tariff cuts, and authorize the President to provide adjustment assistance to those injured or a combination of Federal Assistance and tariff or quota relief.

Those, plus the national security exemption, are the means to use—not political protectionism by special discrimination in favor of one economic bloc or another.

The credibility of this country's professed support of trade liberalization is now being called into question at home and abroad. Should our principal allies become convinced that our support of this policy lacks a conviction, the current GATT negotiations, which have been organized at our own insistence, will fail.

In our rapidly changing world, where new currents of power—economic and political—are moving all around us, the path of the protectionist seems so easy and logical to some at home, but it is a terribly dangerous one. Only by harnessing those mighty new currents of power to the purposes of freedom, only by having the courage and foresight to meet them squarely in the great private enterprise tradition of our country, can we reach for the destiny of free men.

The United States, with the greatest economic power on earth, provides that best guarantee that freedom will prevail on this earth. The greatest catastrophe which could befall the world in terms of international trade, with incalculable effects on freedom everywhere, would be if we abdicated our position as the world's leader in increasing international trade and freeing it from barriers and restrictions by slipping into a protectionist policy of our own. It is to avoid such a catastrophe, with its inevitable destructive retaliation from our Nation's trading partners that has led me to oppose protectionist legislation in general and the Hartke-Herlong approach to anti-dumping in particular.

VIETNAM ELECTIONS—A VITAL FIRST STEP

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday's elections for a constituent assembly in South Vietnam could be the significant first step that we have all been waiting for, the first concrete sign that our joint efforts are paying off. The two

key indicators of success were positive: there was a large voter turnout and there were hardly any charges of fraud. President figures are that over 5 million South Vietnamese or almost three-quarters of the eligible voters cast their ballots.

We should be perfectly clear in our own minds, however, on the meaning of this success. It is not going to produce any new and miraculous harmony or a clearcut mandate. It was not a vote of confidence in any premier or political party. It is not even a definite sign that the South Vietnamese are going to clean their own house and begin to pursue the war against the Communists or their war against want in a more determined fashion.

The success of the elections proves one thing—control. And this is what was really to be tested in the first place. The impressive voter turnout demonstrates that the Saigon government actually controls and is administering the territory of a great majority of the people. The Communists, whatever they will now claim, were trying to sabotage the elections by frightening people away from the polls and candidates from running for office. A poor voter turnout would have indicated that the South Vietnamese people believed the Vietcong was more powerful than the Saigon government.

In the test of wills and strength, the Saigon government demonstrated it could deliver. The people felt safe enough with Saigon's protection to brave the Communist threats.

But the elections are only a beginning, and the task of constitutionmaking, with all the attendant political problems, lies ahead. It is very important that those chosen for this constitution-drafting responsibility concentrate on drafting the constitution and do not busy themselves by taking potshots at the present Government. Similarly, the military junta should exercise restraint in allowing the duly elected delegates to write the constitution without military dictation.

Our job now is to convince the politicians and the military that they need each other. The military chain of command is the only structure that exists in South Vietnam that can implement decisions, and the various political groupings represent the only way decisions can be both made and accepted by the people.

COMMUNIST REPLIES TO SENATOR EASTLAND

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter sent to the editor of the Jackson Daily News.

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

TOUGALOO RED HITS AT EASTLAND

In the July 21 edition of the Jackson Daily News I am mentioned by Senator JAMES EASTLAND as one of "11 known Communists" who "participated and influenced" the recent Meredith-Mississippi March ("EASTLAND Names Reds in March").

It is not my intention in this letter to deny EASTLAND'S "exposure", I am indeed a

"known Communist"—a Marxist, a revolutionary socialist, an open advocate of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and its replacement with a world Socialist order . . . EASTLAND'S intrepid snoopers could have saved the taxpayers' money, for in my two years of civil rights activity in this state I have never attempted to hide my political convictions or my affiliations. Far from denying the charge, I am greatly honored to have been denounced on the Senate floor as an implacable foe of this most qualified representative of degenerate racism.

EASTLAND'S latest blast is a heartening sign to the Negro people and the poor people of the state, for it shows that the old plantation master from Sunflower County is trembling at the spectre of thousands of Mississippians rising up to smash his beloved system of racist oppression.

EASTLAND, who constantly talks of Mississippi's "excellent" race relations, has the tricky job of explaining the mass support of the Meredith-Mississippi March among the state's Negro population, culminating in an enthusiastic rally of some 20,000 at the Capitol in Jackson. The best he can come up with is a handful of alleged Communists who happened to be among the tremendous crowd.

Sorry Senator, but the thousands of Mississippi people moved to action in recent events in the state know they are not "infiltrated." This was the Mississippi peoples' work, "agitated" by you and your kind and the decadent system you so ably represent.

The Senator screams "Communists are staging a revolution in this country." Speaking from the Senator's home state, I say yes indeed Mr. EASTLAND, there is a revolution being staged here, and although "Communists" can hardly be credited with staging it, it is a revolution that deserves the partisan support of all those who work for a society free of racism, violence and exploitation of man by man.

There is a revolution afoot here to destroy the naked rule of the rich, which has made Mississippi the poorest state in the nation; to destroy the vile racism nurtured by EASTLAND and his ilk that blinds men to their common interests in struggle and has denied the most basic of human rights to vast numbers in this state; to destroy the attitude of subservience to a "law and order" designed to perpetuate a reactionary racist order, and to instill the revolutionary will to organize and fight among the oppressed masses of this state. There is a revolution afoot here, which will consign all the Eastlands and everything they represent to their long deserved place on the garbage heap of history.

EASTLAND sees the handwriting on the wall, and fights back with any weapon he can get his hands on; for he knows that a society free of racist oppression means the social, political and economic death of all the James Eastlands of the world.

As a "known Communist" I am proud to be a participant in this revolution that will someday forever silence the James Eastlands.
 PHIL LAPSANSKY.

TOUGALOO, MISS.

ANDREW JACKSON, A NATIVE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on August 30, 1966, my good friend, Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, made a statement on the floor of the House to the effect that Andrew Jackson was born in South Carolina.

My good friend's action on that occasion calls to mind Horace's statement:

But as Homer, usually good, nods for a moment, I think it a shame.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on Friday, September 9, I felt it necessary to take the floor to comment on a front-page article of the Evening Star dated September 8, entitled "Johnson Signs \$6.99 Billion Agriculture Bill."

The article obviously showed that the President had been furnished with inaccurate figures from some source, and I felt it appropriate to spread the accurate facts upon the RECORD. In so doing, I find that the Government Printing Office, in the printing of the RECORD, made an error in copying my remarks. The error appears on page 21247 of the RECORD of September 9. Beginning with the third full paragraph of my remarks in the first column, the first sentence should read:

I think it is also appropriate to say that in several instances the appropriations bill insisted upon including expenditures under the traditional formula for distribution to the States as authorized by law rather than in turning over sizable amounts to be spent at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as recommended by the budget.

I ask that the RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

ANTIDUMPING AND PROTECTIONISM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was heralded as the start of a new era of liberalized world trade policy, yet it has not prevented protectionist forces from attacking this policy in Congress since the act has been in effect.

I have fought protectionist legislation, as protectionism only hurts the consumer and weakens the competitiveness and efficiency of our domestic economy and that of every other country that participates in this practice.

Increasing pressures have been brought on Congress in recent months to amend the Antidumping Act in a fashion that would make it so restrictive as to prevent legitimate forms of international competition and to induce foreign countries to retaliate in kind.

In my view, the best approach to stop this protectionist spiral is to negotiate an international antidumping agreement during the current GATT trade negotiations, and in a recent speech I gave a full exposition of my reasons in support of such an international agreement.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the speech I delivered on this subject before the International Trade and Customs Law Committee of the Federal Bar Association, September 9, 1966, at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington.

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

When the Trade Expansion Act became law four years ago it was hailed as the beginning of a new era of enlightened and liberalized trade policy. The experience of these four years shows that the Act did not prevent protectionist forces from maintaining steady pressure on the Congress—for

some success at times—for protectionist legislation.

I take this opportunity to sound the alarm and to issue a strong warning now as to the consequences of pursuing such policy. The increased protectionism of the Congress is a growing threat and failure or even the absence of a clearcut success at the current GATT negotiations could unleash a worldwide wave of protectionism.

It is clearly in the interest of the United States to support a policy of effective trade liberalization. A policy of protectionism weakens the competitiveness and efficiency of our economy and the economy of each nation that practices it. The United States and its allies need to be economically strong and cohesive. Increasingly greater international trade insures that nations seek to remain competitive and that their resources are used efficiently.

Elimination of restrictions against trade is an essential ingredient of effective international cooperation. The trouble is that we want to have our cake, and eat it, too. We want to expand exports, while increasing restrictions against competitive imports. This would be a nice trick, if it could be done, but such a nearsighted view is like the search for perpetual motion. It sounds trite to repeat it, but it is true—trade is a two-way street. This is the principle which forms the basis of the U.S. negotiating position in Geneva and I can assure you Congress will not approve any agreement that does not reflect this principle.

Make no mistake about it, efforts such as the so-called Hartke-Herlong antidumping bill—sponsored by 32 of my colleagues in the Senate and 97 members of the House of Representatives—are, I regret to say, thinly disguised forms of protectionism.

I am in favor of modernizing the Antidumping Act of 1921 through legislation or regulations that would bring to a halt predatory price discrimination and the unfair use of economic power to destroy competition in international trade. That is why this Act was passed by Congress in the first place and measures that maintain that principle under current conditions have my support and that of other fairminded people.

But, the Hartke-Herlong approach violates this concept. It runs counter to a basic principle of international trade which is based on the idea that trade takes place when people in country A find it to their advantage to purchase a product in country B rather than at home because it is cheaper or more economical. The Hartke-Herlong bill is a move to "protect" by restricting total trade certain American industries—such as steel and cement—against legitimate international competition. If the drive by the U.S. steel industry for legislation such as the Hartke-Herlong bill is motivated by a desire to defend itself against the newly forming European steel cartels than I say they are building a weak defense. Enactment of such legislation would only lead to similar measures in Europe and the U.S. steel industry would be exactly in the same position as it is now. The most effective defense is an international agreement on dumping that would meet head on a predatory attack such as that which could be mounted by European steel cartels without penalizing normal international competition.

In my estimation, and I am pleased to say in the estimation of a growing segment of the business community of the industrialized world and their governments, the best protection against predatory price discrimination and the unfair use of economic power to destroy international competition is the world-wide standardization of laws designed to bring such illegal practices to a halt. Once such standardization is achieved through an international agreement on antidumping, both our economy and the econ-

omies of others will be equitably protected to our mutual advantage.

My main objections to the Hartke-Herlong bill is that: (1) it would deprive the Bureau of Customs and the Treasury of the ability to do more than make a purely mechanical "less than fair value" determination; (2) it would virtually eliminate the Tariff Commission's discretion in the anti-dumping field; and (3) it would practically assure that each complaint would be followed by a "less than fair value" determination and most, if not all, such determination followed by a finding of injury.

The bill, if it became law in its present form, would become a major barrier against legitimate international trade in products competitive with U.S.-made products.

An international anti-dumping code, on the other hand, is desirable because (1) it would blunt the drive in many foreign countries for legislation such as the Hartke-Herlong bill and therefore would remove this potential hindrance to U.S. exports; (2) properly drawn, it would effectively protect American industry against predatory price discrimination and U.S. importers against unfair harassment; and (3) it would eliminate an important bone of contention at the current GATT negotiations and thereby contribute to their successful conclusion.

It would be premature for me to discuss in detail what I think should be included in an antidumping code. On September 12 the Trade Information Committee will begin hearings to examine the complex issues involved in an international agreement on anti-dumping. Expert testimony before these hearings will, I am sure, be very helpful in the construction of an international anti-dumping code, which will be fair to both the domestic industries of trading nations and to importers. At this point let me say only that such a code should, as a minimum, establish uniform definitions of dumping and injury, and uniform administrative practices for entering and prosecuting dumping claims by all the signatories. Such a code should use as a point of departure Article VI of GATT which sets forth the basic GATT rules on dumping and be administered under GATT auspices. Procedures should be established to deal with violators of the code both through the levying of dumping duties and through court sanctions.

I call attention to a valuable position paper issued by the International Chamber of Commerce this June in which they make 19 specific recommendations on the principles on which an international code of anti-dumping procedure should be based. Let me just cite three of them:

"1. Save in exceptional circumstances, anti-dumping procedures should only be initiated when domestic producers submit a complaint to the effect that imports at dumped prices are causing them *material injury* [my italics] * * *

"2. An application should only be accepted by the authority concerned when it is made by or on behalf of domestic producers whose total production of the like goods represents, both in value and volume, a *major* proportion of total domestic output of these goods. * * *

"5. Until such time as a final decision can be taken, no provisional measures should be applied unless they are essential in order to stop or prevent really serious injury, and then only for a limited period."

I urge the Federal Bar Association and Governor Herter's Office to take this report with the utmost seriousness, as it represents the collective judgement of a very knowledgeable segment of the industrialized world.

The question has been raised by the protectionist forces whether or not the President does in fact have any authority to conclude an international agreement on dumping. In my opinion the President does have

that this nation confronts a determined enemy in Viet Nam. I can also tell you that Viet Nam, and a military victory there is vital to our own security and the preservation of liberty and freedom in other parts of the world.

In the performance of our servicemen in that far-away land, I have an enormous pride. Partly this is because of my years of identification with the armed forces; but far more it is because of their heroism, their professional skill, their steadfastness in the supreme challenges of the battlefield.

I for one strongly favor what President Johnson has sought to do and has done there. Particularly I commend the prudence and statescraft he has employed to insure that this crisis does not escalate endlessly, and ultimately engulf all mankind in devastation too horrible to contemplate.

I know that communism is not going to just fade away. I know that communism is going to be a challenge to our way of life for many years to come.

If I have ever been convinced of anything in my life, I am convinced that democracy, and the freedom and dignity of man which go hand-in-hand with it, will out-wear, out-last, and out-live any philosophy or catchphrase that ever emerges from the Kremlin.

We must maintain our position as the leader of the free world.

This will involve sacrifice—the sacrifice of lives, just as we are sacrificing lives today in Viet Nam; the sacrifice of time; the sacrifice of material wealth; and the sacrifice of long family separation.

But neither you young men, nor our citizens, are afraid of sacrifice. We will do whatever must be done. For when all is said and done, the tomorrow of this nation is being entrusted to you—to you, the Army of the future, guardians of the land of the free, imbued with the spirit of Sylvanus Thayer.

I thank you.

STATEMENT BY AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this Congress and the administration is vitally concerned with the inflationary trend presently evident in the economy. Labor is also concerned.

The views of the AFL-CIO executive council on this matter will be of interest and importance in considering what moves can be taken to combat inflation. The executive council's recommendations should be given very serious consideration and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the statement issued at their meeting in Chicago on August 23, 1966:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY, CHICAGO, ILL., AUGUST 23, 1966

Inflation in America is clearly and directly profit inflation.

Profits have skyrocketed—moving up, far out of line with wages and salaries.

The result has been increased living costs that have washed out much of the value of workers' wage gains. In the past year, the buying power of most workers' take-home pay has hardly advanced, at all.

Wage and salary earners have not received a fair and adequate share of the benefits of the economy's forward advance.

In the key manufacturing sector, unit labor costs actually declined 1.9 percent be-

tween 1960 and 1965. But the companies increased the wholesale price level of manufactured goods by 1.7 percent—almost as much as the decline in unit labor costs. In the first half of 1966, the unit labor costs of manufactured goods were only one-tenth of one percent higher than in the same period of 1965, but the wholesale prices of industrial products jumped 2.8 percent.

The spread between unit labor costs and industrial prices has been growing. It is now greater than at any time since mid-1951. Most of this spread reflects widening profit margins. And with the rising volume of sales, profits have soared.

The inequity and injustice of these trends is crystal clear to all who wish to know the facts. Between 1960 and 1965:

Corporate profits soared 52 percent before taxes and 67 percent after payment of taxes.

Dividend payments to stockholders rose 43 percent.

Weekly take-home pay of factory workers increased only 21 percent, and in terms of buying power, merely 13 percent.

Total wages, salary and fringe benefits of all employees in the entire economy increased only 33 percent—reflecting increased employment, as well as gains in wages and salaries. This trend continues in 1966—with wages and salaries lagging behind the sharp rise of profits and dividends.

The continuing shift in income distribution is creating a serious lack of balance between the economy's rapidly rising ability to increase production more efficiently, and sustainable advances in the demand for goods and services.

Soaring profits—aided by the 7 percent tax-credit subsidy for business investment and rapid depreciation write-offs—are fueling the fires of a capital goods super-boom.

The new installations are increasing industry's productive capacity much faster than the demand for goods and services can be expected to rise, on a sustained basis. As a result, there is a growing danger of excess capacity, eventual collapse of the investment boom and a general economic decline. Moreover, in combination with rising military expenditures the capital goods boom is creating a price-boosting psychology among businessmen throughout most parts of the economy.

This one-sector boom, however, should not be confused with generally excessive demand for goods in short supply. Auto sales are down from last year; home-building has dropped sharply; there are no shortages of consumer goods; nor is there any scare-buying or hoarding. Unemployment at 3.9 percent of the labor force—with joblessness rates of over 12 percent for teenagers, nearly 8 percent for Negroes and 4.6 percent for blue-collar workers—is far from full employment.

The Federal Reserve's attempt to curb this capital goods boom has pushed up interest rates to the highest levels in 40 years—boosting the cost of living and throwing residential construction into a depression.

Because of all these factors, the AFL-CIO Executive Council advocates the following economic policies:

1. Restoration of balance between wages, prices, profits and business investment is essential, as well as much lower interest rates.

2. Increases in the buying power of wages and salaries are needed to provide workers with their fair share and provide a healthy advance in mass consumer markets, the foundation of the nation's economy.

3. The major mechanism for achieving rising real earnings in America is collective bargaining—within the framework of the thousands of different markets, industries and occupations, as well as the national economy.

4. Special attention to lift the real wages of the working poor requires the extension of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to millions of low-wage workers and an increase in the federal minimum wage.

5. High and rising business profits and the

economy's rapidly increasing productive efficiency make possible such increases in workers' buying power without raising the price level. In fact, the profits and productivity of many companies are so high that they could simultaneously raise wages and cut their prices to consumers.

6. Achievement of economic balance also requires an effective curb on the capital goods super-boom—through repeal of the 7 percent tax-credit subsidy for business investment in new equipment and/or an increase in corporate taxes. This will also make more funds available for housing, the rebuilding of America's cities and expanded public facilities.

7. Continued growth of the economy is required to achieve and maintain full employment. This means increased real wages and growing consumer markets, as well as sufficient federal funds for the planned expansion of programs to meet the needs of America's growing and increasingly urban population.

8. We urge the Administration and the Congress to provide ample funds to finance an effective war against poverty.

9. Interest rates must be rolled back.

Finally we reiterate our position:

If the President judges the situation to warrant the adoption of extraordinary stabilization methods—designed to bring all costs, prices and profits, as well as wages and salaries, under evenhanded restraint—he can be assured of the support and cooperation of the AFL-CIO. At the present time, there is no such equity, and any such program must apply equitably to all groups in the population and to all components of the cost of living, as well as the cost of production.

We are prepared to sacrifice as much as anyone else, for as long as anyone else, so long as there is equality of sacrifice.

FREEDOM'S ELECTORAL VICTORY

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, despite the predictions of the pessimists and the cynics, the election in South Vietnam has taken place; and despite the doom and gloom prophets the people of South Vietnam have demonstrated—by a 3-to-1 majority—that they have confidence in their country and in its future.

In the aftermath of the election it is gratifying to note that the New York Times, not known for its support of the administration's Vietnam policy, has editorially endorsed the results. I commend to the attention of our colleagues that editorial, which appeared in the Times of September 12, 1966:

SAIGON'S ELECTORAL VICTORY

The elections in South Vietnam were a success for Marshal Ky's Government and indirectly for the Johnson Administration. According to present available figures, three-quarters of the eligible voters cast ballots. This far exceeds Vietnamese and American hopes before election day.

The victory deserves full acknowledgment, but its effects should not be exaggerated. Candidates were merely elected to an assembly which will draw up a constitution leading to still another election in 1967 or 1968 for as representative a government as the situation and political backwardness of the people will permit.

Since large regions of South Vietnam are under Vietcong control, or subject to the Vietcong's threats, the election could not lead to a genuine popular majority. But, insofar as the South Vietnamese people, at

become more and more steeped in the history of our armed forces, and from this I have come to appreciate the critical role of your graduates in preserving and building this nation.

But—more, even, than any of these things—I have, over the years, become increasingly conscious of the truth, that it is character that means the most in human affairs. And, I have learned that, above all else, the United States Military Academy symbolizes Honor, Duty, and Country.

Perhaps, then, considering these things, you can sense why this event today means so much to me and can share my feelings in some measure.

I am aware that Major Thayer's system, which he evolved during his 16 years of superintendency, gave this institution its direction and standards. I know he is rightly immortalized as "Father of the Military Academy."

I realize that he implanted here the rule of absolute honesty and complete integrity; that here he established a curriculum as broad as was consistent with the primary demands of professional training; that it was he who induced every cadet to exercise his faculties to the utmost, to the end that both mind and character would reach for the skies.

I have seen first-hand, over my own years, that these firm foundations laid a century and a half ago by Sylvanus Thayer have continued here to this very moment.

Back in 1914, when I entered the Congress and World War I had just started in Europe, I became concerned about our state of preparedness. That concern has remained with me for more than half a century.

As a Member and later Chairman for sixteen years of what was then the Naval Affairs Committee, I concentrated on the Navy and the Marine Corps. But, at the same time, I was aware then, and even more so in later years, of the need for a vigorous Army capable of meeting our defense requirements.

It was a small Army at that time, and only a handful could foresee that in a few years it would become the mightiest force ever gathered together in the world.

Looking back on those years, I have to admit that Congress was not entirely free of guilt when it came time to earmark funds for our armed forces. The combined military appropriations for 1925, 1930, and 1935, for example, amounted to \$1,132,000,000—a significant fact when we consider that the Army budget alone for this fiscal year is currently \$17,000,000,000 and expected to mount even higher.

In the years leading up to World War II, those of us in the Congress who were concerned about our defense had a lot of talking to do to convince some of our fellow members of the nation's military needs. And while we were busy trying to convert our colleagues (and frequently the Executive Branch of the Government, as well) here at West Point you were busy training our present Army leaders.

Without the training your predecessors received here, without their devotion to duty and their faith in the urgency of their profession, our fantastic expansion and final victory in World War II would not have been possible.

When the Committee on Armed Services was formed in 1947, I became even more familiar with the Army and the Army Air Corps, and shortly thereafter the Air Force, and finally the Air Force Academy.

Our defense structure, by 1947, had undergone considerable change. Nuclear weapons posed grave threats—not only to our security, but to our survival.

I soon realized that the answer to the problems that confronted us, from a defense viewpoint, lay in the creation and maintenance of a stable, balanced force structure,

responsive to any type of military challenge that we might meet.

I did not believe then—nor do I believe now—that a nuclear exchange was likely, if we were prepared to meet every type of threat.

I believed then—as I do now—that this nation must constantly maintain a strong, modern military structure—capable of expansion, but always large enough to meet immediate challenges.

I was always concerned when our active military strength fell below 2,500,000 men, and the Army had less than 1,000,000 men on active duty.

But back in 1947, in addition to the problem of the new and awesome dimension of atomic warfare, the Army and Navy also faced the problem of unification.

We had three services, and there were many who wanted only one service, one chief of staff, and one philosophy of warfare. I opposed this concept then—just as I oppose it now—for I have always felt that the separate services—each an expert in its own missions—are indispensable to our security.

But I did recognize the virtue of one organization overseeing the entire functioning of the separate services.

Thus, the first and most important step that had to be taken to bring about this type of unification was to combine the Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the Congress to form the Armed Services Committees.

Without bringing together into one committee in each house the experienced military and naval congressional personnel we had in the Congress at that time, many of the legislative achievements that are now the law of the land would not have been possible.

I look back now with some pride and with a great deal of satisfaction upon the accomplishments of the House Committee on Armed Services during the fourteen years I served as Chairman. Many of the laws we wrote not only guided the officers who lead the Armed Forces today, but will guide you as you lead the Army of tomorrow.

But I did not come here today to reminisce.

I came, instead, with a heart full of gratitude, to indulge myself, for a few moments, in some admonitions to you men of the Cadet Corps, based upon my half-century of association with the finest men I have ever known—officers and men of the Army of the United States.

When you receive your commission and leave this hallowed ground, you will go forth to face a constantly changing world.

It has been a century of strife and upheaval and they continue today.

You have the great advantage of knowledge and youth.

You also have the great advantage of knowing that you will serve under capable, outstanding officers.

You will have the advantage of serving in a modern Army—an Army with solid tradition, outstanding spirit, and the finest military hardware available.

You will serve in an Army made up of highly educated men and women. You will find a much higher degree of intelligence in the Army today than any period in the history of the nation.

I need not tell you that when you wear the uniform of a cadet of the United States Military Academy, and later the uniform of an officer in the Army of the United States, that you are wearing a uniform that should fill you with pride—pride in the knowledge that you are acquiring skills that will help to preserve the future of our nation; pride in the fact that you are preparing to bear the torch of liberty to light the way for all freedom-loving people everywhere.

It is the fervent hope of all of us that you will never have to apply your knowledge in the hard test of combat. But bear this in mind, the greatest satisfaction that can come to any citizen of our land is to know that he has made a contribution to his nation—that he has helped to preserve and protect our way of life—a way of life unequaled in the history of civilization.

I know of nothing that can give a man a greater feeling of pride than to know that he has done his job well, particularly when he can see the results around him. For you, these results will be the knowledge that our people live in freedom, enjoying the benefits of a form of government that has attained the highest living standard in the world.

As you proceed with your studies here at the Academy, look forward constantly. Don't be content with standing still, because physically it is impossible to stand still. The world is in constant motion and therefore you either move forward or you fall backwards.

When I was told that I was to be the recipient of this great honor, my mind recalled some of the graduates of this academy—men of vision—men who looked forward. I was reminded of Cicero's famous words, "The harvest of old age is the recollection and abundance of blessings previously secured." Among these blessings are my friendships with such men as General Pershing, General Eisenhower, General Bradley, General Gruenther, General MacArthur, and a multitude of others.

Most of the great men of this nation are humble men. And the true test of any man is—

To be able to combine humility with pride; to be wisely aggressive without being dogmatic; to be firm without being stubborn; to be capable of making decisions, without being rash; to accept criticism without resenting it; to be compassionate without being weak; to inspire others, and, at the same time, be inspired by others; to be loyal not only to those whom he serves, but to those who serve under him.

And then there will be the supreme test—the test of leadership. For when all is said and done, you are here to become Army officers—and leaders of men.

No academic course can teach you leadership, but knowledge is the basic ingredient. You can acquire the instincts of leadership by emulation. But first you must have the desire to be a leader.

You must be willing and anxious to accept responsibility.

You must do your level best in every assignment, including those which may appear to you to seem barren of challenge.

Make everything you do in your Army career important—regardless of your own appraisal of the situation.

You have to not only understand an order and know how to carry it out, you must also have the ability to give an order and make sure that it is followed through.

Always think in terms of the whole Army—not just one branch. Remember—except for the one day each year, and that is when you play Navy in your annual football game—you are preparing to become part of a four-service team.

At the same time, never lose pride in your own service—and maintain the integrity of your own military department. Be proud of your heritage, proud of your leaders, proud of this the greatest of all nations on earth, and then be moderately proud of yourself.

As you know, we are currently engaged in a war, which, on some other campuses around the country, has produced considerable friction.

I cannot tell you, nor can anyone tell you, what the future holds in Viet Nam, or any other part of the world. But I can tell you

this stage of their history could record a democratic vote, they have done so.

Marshal Ky, himself, has been an in-again-out-again candidate for the office of an elected president, but it is obvious that any future government would have to be either military or, if civilian, willing to prosecute the war. The conflict will go on pretty much as if the election, despite its undoubted value and success, had not taken place.

Hanoi's inflexible rejection of President Johnson's offer of a mutually agreed withdrawal of troops from South Vietnam shows that neither the time nor the circumstances are ripe for negotiations or a truce.

The block on the road to peace has been made clear again and again by both sides, as it was in the recent exchange. The United States says that Hanoi is the aggressor and North Vietnam says that Washington is the aggressor. Behind the simple accusations are all the complex forces of power politics, ideology, nationalism and emotions that make the war in Vietnam so stubborn and, for the moment, so intractable.

Yet, the effort to solve it and to bring about negotiations must go on. The United States cannot assume that Hanoi literally means, and always will mean, exactly what it says today. North Vietnam may one day accept the fact that the United States really intends to withdraw from Southeast Asia when circumstances permit, and Hanoi may also hope that the American escalation of the war will not continue to a point of no return.

In the diplomatic game that goes on behind the crack of guns and thunder of bombs, the ideals for which the United States stands gained a point in yesterday's election. The Vietcong, the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists lost by the same margin. The war goes on, but it has been proved that three out of four of those who could vote in South Vietnam braved danger and future risk to do so, and thereby expressed either support for or acquiescence in what the Saigon Government is trying to do.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY ADDRESSES NATIONAL PLOWING MATCH AT JEFFERSON, IOWA

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

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on Friday afternoon it was my privilege to be on the speaker's platform when our very able and popular Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, spoke during the national plowing matches in Jefferson, Iowa.

Thousands of people from my fine State of Iowa and neighboring States were there on a beautiful day to hear one of their fellow midwesterners talk about Iowa's most important industry—agriculture.

With acres of the best crops in years around him, Vice President HUMPHREY clearly and succinctly outlined the aims and aspirations of the administration's farm program. I believe that it was the best presentation on the agriculture program that I have heard.

For that reason, I place the Vice President's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, NATIONAL PLOWING MATCH, SEPTEMBER 9, 1966, JEFFERSON, IOWA

I am delighted to be back with so many good friends. This is not my first visit to a

National Plowing Match. And I hope to be here many more times again.

I did not come here today to tell you that you never had it so good.

I did not come to criticize or to lecture. I have come to Iowa to thank you, on behalf of the President, for a job well done.

I have come to thank you for your patience. I have come to thank you for your responsible stewardship of our vital soil resources.

I have come to thank you for your hard work . . . for your ingenuity . . . for your progressive thing . . . for your unsung success in making America the best-nourished nation in the world.

I have come to thank you for being the resourceful, productive people that you are.

And I have come to tell you that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is fully committed to giving the American farmer his full and rightful place in our growth and our prosperity.

He deserves nothing less. He must have nothing less.

Let me take a few moments today to put into perspective the challenges we Americans face in the world today, and especially those challenges which directly involve and affect the American farmer.

The overwhelming fact of our time—a fact that is being recognized far too late in the day—is this: That in a world of hunger, there can be no peace.

Governments have risen and fallen on their ability, or inability, to feed their people. And political leaders in the hungry countries are increasingly realizing that neither promises, gold nor prestige will substitute for the basic nourishment of their people.

Per-capita food production in the volatile and poverty-stricken continents of Asia, Latin America and Africa is going down and, unless the trend is reversed, will continue going down for the foreseeable future.

As President Johnson said earlier this year when he proposed the Food for Freedom program:

" . . . The time is not far off when all of the combined production, of all the acres, of all the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of developing nations—unless present trends are changed."

We must meet this challenge in order to move ahead on the narrow road to peace.

We stand ready and committed to lead in the war on hunger. For we stand not only as the richest and most powerful nation on earth, but also as the nation with the greatest agricultural resources.

When we look at American agriculture, we see industry strong and highly developed in its productive efficiency. We see an industry rapidly creating, and adjusting to, change. Productivity has increased more rapidly on our farms than in the rest of our economy. One American farm worker today produces enough to feed 37 people—nearly twice as many as only 12 years ago.

In recent years we also have created and improved the machinery of government programs designed to assist agriculture. Neither the machinery nor the programs have been perfect, but we are trying each day to make them better.

We see, too, an agriculture where, since 1961, a better balance has been achieved between supply and demand.

The surplus is gone. It no longer hangs over markets to depress them. The rate of consumption is growing.

We see, in short, an agriculture superbly and uniquely qualified to help meet the challenge not only of expanding domestic markets, but of a hungry world.

Many of us have seen the article on American agriculture in the current issue of Fortune magazine.

The trends that article points out—trends the American people are increasingly aware of—are these: that the American farmer is entering a seller's market . . . that farm out-

put and farm receipts are headed upward . . . and that a new era of farm prosperity can be at hand.

Yes, for American agriculture, there is a new day ahead.

We must be ready for that day. We must do what is needed to meet the times.

We must be ready to expand American agricultural production.

And we must be ready for changes in emphasis in our government agricultural policies.

Today we need to expand production of wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and dairy products.

In the last four years the world has consumed some 200 million bushels of wheat per year more than it has produced.

In the last four years it has utilized about 6 million tons of feed grains more than it has harvested.

In the case of soybeans, we are using all we produce. Carryovers are minimal. The demand continues to grow.

There is every indication we will need big crops in these commodities for several years hence.

Our production of milk is insufficient now. That is why we have raised the support level for manufacturing milk to four dollars per hundredweight.

We also need to determine and announce government programs at an early date. And we will. For example, we should not—and we shall not—postpone until just before planting time the feed grain and oilseed production goals the Department of Agriculture recommends as desirable in 1967. We all know that more and more farm plans are now made so far in advance that there isn't much left undecided by Christmas for the next year's production program.

We need to maintain adequate reserves.

We must have food reserves for national security. We must have them to assure our markets of adequate supply at fair prices.

We must have them to serve as a cushion against bad weather—as visualized by the late Henry A. Wallace in the ever-normal-granary concept.

Our reserves have fallen faster than expected because crop weather in many parts of the world, including India, has been bad. (Furthermore, it is not generally realized that in the last three years imports of wheat by the Soviet Union even exceed those of India.)

So we must have reserves.

These reserves can and should be insulated from the marketplace. They will be used if needed, but they are not meant to be used in direct competition with sales by farmers. The Commodity Credit Corporation should not be and will not be your competitor. Its use should supplement—not supplant—farm income.

Our position of world leadership requires that we maintain an arsenal of food and fiber just as we maintain an arsenal of military weapons.

But your government has no intention of calling upon the American farmer to provide that arsenal at the sacrifice of a fair price and a decent income.

Farm producers are well aware of what happened to them at the end of the Korean War.

They remember that their government called upon them to expand production and open up new acres, and they remember what happened to prices and income.

They went down, down and down.

We have no intention of calling on American agriculture to pay the cost of policies and programs that belong to the entire nation.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration knows that the American farmer is doing more than his share in helping to create well-being and prosperity in his country. We know that he is doing more than his

share in helping to create a freer and more peaceful world. And we will not be satisfied until he stands in the position of equality he deserves in our society.

Today, partly because of farm legislation achieved in the past few years, we are seeing an improvement in farm income.

On September 1, 1960, you were selling your hogs in Chicago for \$15.46 a hundredweight. On September 1 of this year you were getting \$24.89 a hundredweight.

Number one yellow soybeans were bringing you \$2.20 a bushel in Chicago on September 1, 1960. On that same date this year they brought you \$3.78 a bushel.

Farmers were receiving \$1.18 a bushel in Chicago for their number 3 yellow corn on September 1, 1960. Six years later that corn was bringing them \$1.46 a bushel. And if you were in the Feed Grains Program you received an average of \$1.71 a bushel.

The price to farmers for manufacturing milk was \$3.19 a hundredweight in August of 1960. In August of this year it was \$4.18 a hundredweight.

Choice grade beef steers weighing between 900 and 1100 pounds were bringing farmers \$24.75 on September 1, 1960. The price had risen to \$25.75 on September 1, 1966.

And number 2 hard winter wheat was selling in Kansas City for \$1.97 on September 1, 1960. Six years later, with the Wheat Certificate Program in operation, farmers were receiving an average of \$2.46 for the same type wheat.

The farm programs begun by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration have worked. They have had a favorable effect on farm income. We should not abandon them. Rather, we should continue to make improvements in them which will work for the benefit of all our farmers and those living in rural America.

Most of you recall that farm legislation was difficult to pass in 1961 and 1963.

Feed grain legislation was a nip-and-tuck affair in the United States House of Representatives in 1963. Only one Member of Congress from Iowa voted for the Administration's Farm Bill that year. That one supporter was Congressman NEAL SMITH. He also was the only Democrat in the Iowa Congressional delegation that year.

When only one member of a delegation of seven supported the farm bill, Members of Congress from urban districts were puzzled. Why, they asked, would a farm bill be opposed by six out of seven representatives from the great farm state of Iowa?

They weren't puzzled very long. In 1964, Iowa made some needed changes in its representation in the House of Representatives. Your delegation went from one Democrat and six Republicans to six Democrats and one Republican. And when the issue of extending the feed grain program came up in 1965, it was supported by all six Democratic members, Representatives NEAL SMITH, JOHN CULVER, BERT BANDSTRA, STANLEY GREIGG, JOHN HANSEN, and JOHN SCHMIDHAUSER.

It was opposed by the one hold-over Republican. But a number of Republicans from such states as Minnesota and Kansas joined in supporting the 1965 farm bill. It was passed with votes to spare.

You will continue to need these men in the Congress to provide leadership in Washington to match that of Governor Harold Hughes in Iowa—prudent, progressive, strong leadership—which benefits the people of this state. You need, too, Pat Touchae to give the Third District the same representation. I hope the good people of Iowa will see to that this November.

Last year, President Johnson sent to the Congress a truly remarkable state paper: His Farm Message.

That message dealt at length with the need for parity of income for commercial farmers, for price support and production adjustment programs. It emphasized a market-oriented

policy, calling for restraint in the role of government in supply and distribution.

It dealt also with long-range cropland adjustment, reserve stocks and agricultural trade. It recognized the key role of agriculture in the achievement of broad economic policy objectives for the nation and in world affairs.

It outlined plans for establishing a National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber, which is now reviewing our farm policies across-the-board.

And the President urged that we use our agricultural abundance and technical skills in agriculture to assist the developing nations to stand on their own feet.

President Johnson's Farm Message was a blueprint for the future. It deserves the support not only of the American farmer, but of all Americans.

For what it, in essence, set forth was the President's faith that the people of a free society can accomplish far more than people living under the oppressive weight of totalitarian controls and dogma.

Today nothing is more obvious than the failure of Communist societies to meet the food and fiber needs of their own people—much less the needs of others in the world.

As a result, the developing nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America look increasingly to America and other free nations—not just for food and fiber, but also for answers as to how they can do more to feed and clothe themselves.

That is why I believe that, in the long run, our food power—far more than military power—can be the critical factor in the achievement both of democratic institutions and of safety in the world.

Food power is our secret weapon.

Food is life. Food is strength. Food is hope and compassion.

Food is the giver of health and vigor to children. Food is the vital ingredient of social stability and peaceful change.

Let us use that power wisely and well.

Let us, in the world, act in the same spirit that today is everywhere in our society at home—a spirit of building, of progress, of commitment to equality and justice.

Let us use the tremendous resources at our command to bring health, education, food and the techniques of modern agriculture to struggling nations living in the shadow of famine and outside aggression.

It is today our challenge and our responsibility—to replace, throughout the world, the blind stare of hunger and poverty with the clear vision of a freer and happier day ahead.

If we meet that responsibility, we have the chance—as few others ever have—to be remembered in history not as makers of war, but as makers of peace . . . not for our wealth, but for our compassion . . . not for our things, but for our ideals.

I have faith that we Americans—and especially those Americans who draw their strength from the rich earth—will prove equal to that responsibility.

I have faith that our productivity, our experience, our knowledge, our determination, can be successful in the building of a world where lights shine forth from every window . . . where the bounty of earth waves free across open fields . . . where children stand strong and straight to face a future filled with peace and promise.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT'S ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the President's anti-

inflation program which he has now outlined to the Congress.

Inflation is an insidious enemy, striking stealthily, hunting the weak, and weakening the strong. Only a comprehensive governmental program, stoutly supported by every segment of the economy, can cope with its dangers.

One of the most important and effective steps that can be taken in our effort to beat inflation, is for this Congress to support the President's suggestion that we suspend the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation program.

The investment tax credit of 7 percent became effective in 1962. It had been enacted by the Congress as part of a comprehensive plan to stimulate the economy. Unemployment stood at too high a level and strong measures were needed to restore prosperity.

The investment tax credit program was simple and effective, but the problems of 1966 require a reappraisal of that measure.

The President has now focused the Nation's attention on the needs of 1966.

We should remember that the programs we are asked to suspend were designed to take care of a particular problem. That problem is not only now solved, but the pressures are now operating in the opposite direction.

We have too much to lose to allow that to continue.

These steps we are asked to take are not easy, but they are firm and they are prudent.

We have been asked to assist in preserving what we have only begun to enjoy.

The fixed incomes of millions of Americans must continue to have meaning in the marketplace.

The real wages we are paid must not be allowed to be eroded by prices increasing at too fast a rate.

We need now to suspend these programs which successfully brought us out of a long-departed trough, but now threaten us when we are near the peak.

Once again we see the emergence of historic Democratic philosophy—a real concern for the well-being of people as individuals as opposed to the attention paid by our opponents to the interests of property.

The President has proposed a bold and constructive program, I urge the Congress to move immediately to do its part.

LETTER TO CONSTITUENTS

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

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter I am sending to some of my constituents:

DEAR FRIEND: I have represented you as your Congressman for 24 years.

I am running for re-election on my record of service.

I am one of 435 members of the House of Representatives.

I rank 28th in seniority. Because of this seniority and hard work, I hold a powerful position of influence in the Congress which I have always used for the benefit of the citizens I represent.

an issue bearing on the integrity of the Presidency. Nothing could undermine the President's position more than a situation in which he calls upon other nations to take action which the United States has actually rejected for itself in advance. Cynicism is not among the values that give distinction to American history.

The first essential both of policy at home and policy abroad is the total credibility of the President. Nothing could be more vital in the present situation than for the President himself to dispel any doubts that may have been raised by the record at Geneva or by official or semi-official spokesmen. The President can best do this by taking part in the effort to obtain vital agreement in the field of arms control, whether with respect to non-proliferation of nuclear weapons or a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing. He can eliminate existing confusion by putting into action the policies he has declared to be essential. If the McNamara proposal has virtue as a means of breaking the deadlock, he should say so.

Recent history has demonstrated it is only when the President himself takes direct part in negotiations that important breakthroughs and results are likely to be achieved. What happens otherwise is that the President's own announced purposes stand in danger of being nibbled to death by naysayers and cramped strategists in the operational branches.

The needs described by the President at Idaho Falls are the dominant needs affecting the safety and security of the American people. If we are to make substantial progress in meeting these needs, the President's role must be decisive.

COLUMBUS, GA., ENQUIRER DISCUSSES EFFECTS OF CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate an excellent editorial from the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer discussing the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1966. The editorial is both discerning and timely in its discussion of the proposed legislation.

The editorial recounts previous struggles over bills of this kind and notes quite correctly that whatever the proponents of those measures said they were not intended to do very often turned out being done, the net result being to deprive American citizens of more rights and liberties than were purportedly granted to anyone. Moreover, legislation of this type in the past has certainly been no panacea in the area of human relations, as the editorial points out.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer, Sept. 9, 1966]

LIGHT WITH THE SOUND

Senate debates on civil rights bills are traditionally a means of consuming time rather than changing minds.

But the Senate opponents of the 1966 Civil Rights Bill actually have hopes that their extended arguments will provide light as well as sound, and will rise above the level of a calculated filibuster.

Unhappily, in the past, neither side has paid much attention to the arguments on civil rights bills, no matter how logical or judicious they were. Minds snapped shut at the mere mention of the bill's title.

The stock reaction of civil rights supporters is to claim that opponents are "reading

too much" into the bill and are suffering hallucinations about its intentions.

For instance, during debate on the 1957 bill, Sen. RICHARD RUSSELL raised the specter of federal troops being sent to enforce school integration.

"Ridiculous," cried the bill's supporters. A few weeks later, the paratroopers landed in Little Rock.

The 1963-64 bill was supposed to get the "racial struggle out of the streets." Opponents expressed fear that passage of the bill under duress of mobs would encourage similar mob tactics in the future. Not so, said the backers.

Opponents kept complaining that the bill would give the Department of Health, Education and Welfare the right to withhold federal funds on a whim.

Fiddleticks, replied the backers, our boys at HEW aren't like that.

But you might ask the superintendents of 50 Georgia school systems—some of them among the most heavily integrated in the state—who still haven't been approved for funds this year.

Now comes the 1966 bill, with its "open housing" clause.

Sen. RUSSELL, the old ringmaster of anti-civil rights battles, has picked up a valuable new ally this year, and he's letting him carry the ball for the time being. The ally is Sen. EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican minority leader.

Southerners have usually fought their civil rights battles without open support of senators from outside the South. They'll have some help this year.

But as in the past, the arguments of law and constitutionality will be dismissed by civil rights supporters as merely a mask for segregationist sentiment.

To an extent, that is true, but it is far from the whole truth. There ARE honest and sincere and serious questions involved which affect everyone's rights, and also the future structure of the democratic system.

The quest for legal protection of Negro rights and the elimination of racial barriers is itself a type of mask—a mask that covers a bewildering growth of governmental authority and responsibility in a nation that has previously emphasized individual choice and initiative.

The problem is not one which lends itself to easy catchwords or simplifications. Justice and wisdom reside on both sides of the civil rights debate. So does honor. It is not a dispute between bigots and wild-eyed radicals, but between sincere advocates seeking a solution to a dilemma which has baffled nations and cultures since the dawn of time.

A short view might favor passage of the current bill, but a long view advises that the liberty and strength of this nation and its competitive system will be best served by resisting further governmental solutions to personal problems.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM SUPPORT ESSENTIAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in fiscal 1964 the national investment in research and development was estimated at \$19 billion. Two-thirds of this was from Federal sources. Some of the research supported was of the most basic kind. In other words, it was not done to meet particular needs for, say, a cancer cure or a bigger and better rocket booster. Rather it was intended to look into basic questions such as the life process and the expansion of the universe—questions whose answers will have no particular application but will serve as important blocks of knowledge on which to build the scientific advances of the future.

In fiscal 1967 the administration budgeted \$185 million for basic research project grants to be awarded by the National Science Foundation. Although funding basic research is important and necessary, I seriously question the wisdom of a \$65 million jump in this item from the fiscal 1965 total of almost \$120 million, especially at a time when we are seemingly unable to continue the special milk program for schoolchildren at past levels.

The milk program provides the most immediate kind of benefits for each tax dollar spent. It means healthier lives for a great number of the Nation's schoolchildren. It means less pressure on the Federal Government to purchase and store surplus milk at the taxpayers' expense. And it means better income for dairy farmers as the consumption of milk at school is stimulated.

If the Federal Government is to continue to play an important role in sponsoring basic research, it must not turn its back on the very practical problem of providing enough funds for the school milk program, as well as other federally sponsored social help programs, to prosper and grow. This is why I intend to fight for the appropriation of at least an additional \$6 million for the school milk program in fiscal 1967. This amount is essential if the Federal Government is once again to reimburse local communities under the program at the rate used prior to fiscal 1966.

AMBASSADOR BOWLES' ASSESSMENT OF SITUATION IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, a note of optimism, albeit cautious optimism, has been sounded on the situation in Vietnam by Hon. Chester Bowles. Ambassador Bowles, upon returning to his post at New Delhi following a trip through southeast Asia, expressed his personal assessment of the situation at a news conference August 17. His statement on that occasion is deserving of notice because it represents an intelligent, well-informed view, and because it states the U.S. hope for Asia:

That the day will soon come when India and the noncommunist nations of Asia will themselves organize an effective effort to assure that the tragedy of Vietnam is not repeated elsewhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Ambassador Bowles' statement in New Delhi on August 17 be printed in the RECORD.

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

CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM FROM VIETNAM
(By Chester Bowles, U.S. Ambassador to India)

I have just returned to India from a week-long visit to Southeast Asia, during which I had a chance to observe at first hand recent developments in Thailand, Laos, and particularly South Vietnam.

These three countries, as you know, are now the immediate targets of communism in Southern and Southeastern Asia. My purpose in visiting them was to make a personal estimate of how well they are standing up to this pressure.

September 12, 1966

I would like to add that this was my sixth visit to Southeast Asia in fourteen years, and that I return to India much encouraged.

In Laos the situation has improved dramatically in the past two years, largely as a result of the present Prime Minister's determination to keep his country from being swallowed up by communist elements. Although the communist-led forces still control nearly one-third of the population, they are steadily losing ground.

Thailand, which has been publicly named by the Chinese Government as the communists' next Southeast Asia target, is also taking energetic and constructive steps to meet the threat.

In the Northeastern part of the country, Government forces are vigorously hunting down Chinese-trained communist saboteurs and assassins who have been sent into the peaceful villages of this area to disrupt and to destroy.

In support of this rural security programme, Thai Government, with the support of the United States, is pressing forward with intensive economic and social development programmes even in the most remote sections of the country.

In South Vietnam, a 1,500-mile trip by plane, helicopter, and jeep, covering many outlying provinces, left me cautiously optimistic. Although the military struggle is still intense, it is now clear that the South Vietnamese armed forces, vigorously supported by American and other allied units, are steadily gaining ground.

The officers and men of the four divisions we visited in the field offered impressive evidence that in the last year, and particularly in the last six months, they have been successfully wearing down their communist adversaries.

This claim was fully borne out by my own observations. For instance, in a rural province sixty miles east of Saigon I drove in a jeep for some fifteen miles through countryside which less than two months before had been under the control of regular Viet Cong units.

However, we must not forget that North Vietnam has sent forty to fifty thousand of its regular army troops into South Vietnam both by way of the Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos and directly across the demilitarized zone which divides North and South Vietnam. These are professional soldiers who fight in uniform and are armed with the most modern Chinese weapons.

Therefore, unless the Hanoi Government can somehow be persuaded to negotiate a peaceful settlement, it will be some time before the military situation can be stabilized.

Another dimension of the South Vietnamese Government's massive effort to establish political stability, which I had a chance to examine at first hand, are the many impressive self-help projects such as the construction of schools, clinics, roads, housing, and central markets.

Training programmes similar to those being developed here in India are also going forward. For example, since my last visit to South Vietnam in July 1963, over 5,500 school teachers have been graduated and training programmes for thousands of civil administrators are well under way.

When you consider that the population of South Vietnam is less than that of the Indian state of Kerala and that a full-scale war is in progress, this is an impressive performance. Although the United States is providing most of the material resources, the effort is going forward under increasingly competent South Vietnamese leadership and direction.

By all odds the most important political development in the period immediately ahead will be the September 11th election for the formation of a Constituent Assembly. This will be the first national election ever held in South Vietnam, and I believe its outcome

will be a decisive milestone in the future of Southeast Asia.

For the last several years the Viet Cong, echoed by their Chinese communist supporters, have been attempting to persuade people all over the world that they represent the revolutionary majority of the South Vietnamese whose will is being frustrated by a "reactionary" South Vietnamese Government supported by the "imperialist" United States.

There is already ample evidence that this claim is false. For instance, no important South Vietnamese political or military personage and no South Vietnamese military unit has ever defected to the Viet Cong. On two occasions the Viet Cong have failed dismally in their efforts to organize a general strike.

I believe the September election will offer further evidence that far from representing the sober, hardworking, long-suffering people of South Vietnam, the Viet Cong speak for only a minority who will seek by every possible means to prevent the democratic test of a free election.

In preparing for this election South Vietnam has been divided into 108 electoral districts, plus nine additional seats provided for tribal minority groups, in a procedure similar to the one followed here in India.

Five hundred and forty-two candidates have been registered, which means that about five individuals will contest for each seat. The largest number of candidates are school teachers, closely followed by doctors, labour, business, and rural leaders.

Once elected, this Constituent Assembly will prepare a democratic constitution for South Vietnam. In February, at about the same time that India will be holding its own elections, a fully responsible, representative government will be chosen under this new constitution by another free vote. The present government will then resign and the new one will take its place.

If the September 11th election is held on schedule and a significant number of people in this war-torn country are able and willing to vote, the result will represent a massive democratic repudiation of communist claims and a decisive political victory for the South Vietnamese Government.

Consequently, the communists will do everything in their power to keep the South Vietnamese people away from the polls. Between now and election day we shall no doubt see an intense communist programme of intimidation, assassination, and harassment. Indeed, the campaign was already beginning while I was there last week.

It is expected that more than 500 press representatives from all over the world will be able to witness the election from the vantage point of each of the forty-three provinces and from Saigon and report the full facts to their readers. I hope this press gathering will include many of India's ablest reporters, editors, and commentators.

Speaking more generally, I returned to New Delhi deeply impressed with the increasing determination of the noncommunist nations of East and Southeast Asia to create a solid base for their own security, *vis-a-vis* China, and to assure their own economic growth. Foreign Minister Thanat's recent proposal for an all-Asia conference to bring peace to Vietnam was promptly supported by Japan, the Philippines, Malaysia, and other nations.

I also found considerable interest in India. Several South Vietnamese political leaders asked me about the Indian Constitution and its Parliamentary system, while developmental officials were interested in your programmes in school building, malaria control, agriculture, and small industries.

However, the most pointed questions in Thailand, Laos, and South Vietnam concerned India's broad approach to Asian affairs. Particular concern and interest was expressed in India's view of China. I was

frequently asked whether India saw Chinese expansionism simply as a phenomenon limited to the Himalayan area or rather as a threat to all the people of noncommunist Asia.

So much for the situation in Southeast Asia as I saw it. Now let me review briefly my own government's attitude toward the developments which I have described and particularly to the pursuit of a just peace in South Vietnam.

There are several fundamental points:

1. The bombing of North Vietnam by United States planes is restricted to military targets which are being used by Hanoi in support of its aggression against South Vietnam. The U.S. remains prepared to cease this bombing the moment that Hanoi agrees to take some reciprocal action.

2. The United States reaffirms its offer, which it has made on innumerable occasions, to join with others in negotiating a peaceful settlement. We are prepared unconditionally to discuss any proposals which may lead toward a peaceful settlement, including the so-called Four Points set forth by North Vietnam.

For the record, may I remind you that the United States has replied affirmatively to the peace initiatives sponsored or participated in by India. We welcomed the proposals of the nonaligned nations in Belgrade on April 8, 1965. We welcomed President Radhakrishnan's proposal on the 24th of that same month. Again we welcomed Mrs. Gandhi's Geneva proposal of July 8, 1966. The United States has consistently supported reconvening the Geneva Conference and a settlement based on the essentials of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Accords.

3. The United States does not threaten the existence of the Government of North Vietnam. We hold no animosity toward the people of North Vietnam; indeed, President Johnson has repeatedly pledged our assistance for the economic development of North Vietnam once peace has been restored.

4. The United States has no intention or desire to maintain military bases in Southeast Asia. We are pledged to withdraw our troops from South Vietnam as soon as its security and freedom of choice have been assured.

5. The United States does not oppose the reunification of Vietnam. We support the right of self-determination through the free choice of the Vietnamese people. Similarly, the United States does not oppose the neutrality or nonalignment of the countries of Southeast Asia if that is the course they choose.

6. However, until the communists agree to negotiate a peaceful settlement by one means or another, the United States will continue to support South Vietnam's resistance to aggression. We shall maintain our efforts until the aggression ceases and South Vietnam is allowed to determine its own future, free of outside coercion.

7. This policy reflects the consistent determination of my Government since 1941 to resist aggression in Asia and to create here the basis for stability, prosperity, and freedom.

In World War II this determination caused us to oppose Japanese aggression throughout Asia. It then led to our participation in the U.N. opposition to the communist invasion of South Korea. It led us to defend Taiwan, and in 1962 it brought us promptly to your support when Chinese forces violated India's northern borders.

After this vast and costly effort by the American Government, our abandonment of the people of South Vietnam is unthinkable. Not only would millions of dedicated South Vietnamese be ground under by the communists, but the determination of the United States Government to support and assist the free nations of Asia—including India—would become subject to serious

September 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21377

doubt both by these nations and by their communist adversaries.

May I add that we are hopeful that the day will soon come when India and the noncommunist nations of Asia will themselves organize an effective effort to assure that the tragedy of Vietnam is no repeated elsewhere.

MARGARET SANGER: "ONE OF HISTORY'S GREAT REBELS AND A MONUMENTAL FIGURE"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, editorial comments will be written about the late Margaret Sanger henceforth because her concern was for all mankind, and her crusade on behalf of family planning made sense when people listened.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial and a news story by Martin Tolchin, published in the New York Times of Sunday, September 11, be printed in the RECORD.

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

MARGARET SANGER'S LEGACY

(By Martin Tolchin)

As a young nurse on New York's Lower East Side, Margaret Sanger specialized in maternity cases. She saw women, weary and old at 35, resorting to self-induced abortions which frequently caused their deaths.

Mrs. Sanger nursed one mother, close to death after a self-inflicted abortion, back to health, and heard the woman plead with a doctor for protection against another pregnancy.

"Tell Jake to sleep on the roof," the physician said.

The mother died six months later during a second abortion. Mrs. Sanger renounced nursing.

"I came to a sudden realization that my work as a nurse and my activities in social service were entirely palliative and consequently futile and useless to relieve the misery I saw all about me."

At that point Mrs. Sanger, who coined the phrase "birth control," began her crusade to free women from sexual servitude, as she saw it.

The fiery feminist, who died last week at the age of 82, survived Federal indictments, a one-month jail term, numerous arrests and lawsuits, hundreds of raids on her clinics and the combined opposition of the Catholic and Protestant churches to see much of the world accept her view that family planning was a basic human right.

OPPOSITION TO APPROVAL

Mrs. Sanger saw Protestant opposition turn to approval. Catholic opposition appears to be all but surmounted. Legal barriers to birth control have all but been removed.

Pope Paul VI acknowledged in a recent interview that he was reappraising the church's teaching on the subject of birth control.

Mrs. Sanger's American Birth Control League, established in 1921, became the Planned Parenthood Federation of America in 1946. The federation today has centers in 150 cities in the United States and 38 member organizations and projects in 68 other countries.

"It was she who convinced America and the world that control of conception is a basic human right and like other human

rights must be equally available to all," said Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, president of the Planned Parenthood Worldwide Association.

MARGARET SANGER

When Margaret Higgins, one of eleven children of a stonecutter, looked around Corning, N.Y., she observed that "large families were associated with poverty, toil, unemployment, drunkenness, cruelty, fighting, jails; the small ones with cleanliness, leisure, freedom, light, space, sunshine." It was only a child's view, but it helped to change the world. As Margaret Sanger she was one of history's great rebels and a monumental figure of the first half of the twentieth century.

The economics of poverty, the limited resources of the planet measured against the limitless capacity of mankind to increase, has at last brought most governments and most religions to recognize the necessity of birth control. But it was for the liberation of women as individuals that Mrs. Sanger began her crusade in 1913. The population explosion had not been thought of when she first published "Woman Rebel," and first went to jail in 1914, and when she opened America's first birth-control clinic in Brooklyn fifty years ago.

The birth-control movement grew out of one woman's outrage at the suffering she saw among the poor. It grew into a view of family planning accepted and practiced in a majority of American homes, a cause widely and wisely promoted throughout the world and an international consensus that population control is necessary to human welfare and global peace.

NEGRO UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President the distinguished business editor of the Washington Post, Mr. Hobart Rowen, recently authored an important column on the problem of Negro unemployment.

Mr. Rowen calls attention to the disturbing fact that the unemployment rate among Negroes is now 8.2, nearly 2½ times the rate among whites. He makes clear that this situation is close to the heart of the frustrations and difficulties experienced by the Negro in the United States.

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

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

NEGRO UNEMPLOYMENT—IT'S TIME TO OPEN THE DOORS

(By Hobart Rowan)

Probably the most discouraging statistic to come out of the Washington numbers-factory lately is the higher Negro unemployment rate. At 8.2 percent in August, it is nearly 2½ times the white unemployment rate of 3.4 percent. Thus, in the middle of the biggest economic boom in history, the Negro is not gaining, he is losing, in the area in which he needs help most—jobs.

Worst of all, officials say they are at a loss to explain this phenomenon. Until recently, the theory that prosperity would reach out even for the disadvantaged and the unskilled seemed to be proving out. Even the barrel-bottom would get scraped, we were told.

In the early months of the year, Negro unemployment had dropped to around 7 percent, still double the white rate but a considerable improvement from the level of the

spring of 1966, when it was 8.6 percent. At least, the jobless total was coming down in step with the general trend.

But the situation since May has deteriorated: while unemployment continues to edge down among whites, it has moved up considerably among Negroes. Nor is it a question just of the teenager problem. That is simply the worst spot of all, with an unemployment rate of 27 percent among Negro youth.

The worsened job outlook is among Negro men, Negro women, as well as among Negro teen-agers. It runs through all industries, and in all sections of the country.

There are a number of unhappy developments contributing to the situation, in the opinion of worried and well-informed persons in Washington.

First of all, the drive in private industry to hire Negroes apparently has lost steam, in part, perhaps, because national attention has been diverted from civil rights to Vietnam. Moreover, the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission never developed into a tough, viable agency. Since May, it has been without a chairman. Now, under Stephen N. Shulman, former general counsel of the Air Force, it may get going again.

It should be acknowledged, at the same time, that many companies have made honest efforts to recruit—and have been rebuffed. They must keep trying, for it's hard to undo in a few years the damage done in a century.

Second, as a recent Labor Department study shows, industry and commerce is expanding in the suburbs, not in the central cities. Job opportunities have thereby been exported to suburbia, where segregated housing patterns prevail. Thus, it becomes increasingly difficult for Negroes to find the jobs and pay their way to them.

And finally, the industrial job expansion which is at the heart of the boom is probably calling for skills or the ability to learn that many of the disadvantaged Negroes simply do not have.

White society has kept the Negro in the ghetto so long that it is not surprising that many are beyond recall. Some of the current poverty programs amount to no more than a massive dole designed to keep a lid on a powder keg.

But there are plenty of things that must be done. Employers who have rested on their laurels, pleased as punch because they've hired one or two Negroes, need to be pushed again into a vigorous, positive effort to find, hire and train.

In the short run companies escaping to suburbia may do well. But in the long run, if business shifts to the suburbs while the ghettos remain intact, they are risking a period of unrest—even revolution—that will make the 1965-66 riots look pale.

What business had better do is to back open housing programs in the suburbs. More money will have to be spent on basic education and training programs.

The Government, for its part, needs to dig deeper into the various root causes for Negro unemployment. In all probability, the situation is probably even worse than portrayed. A special Labor Department survey for March, for example, showed 150,000 Negro men aged 25 to 64 in the big city slums not even looking for work—and therefore not counted among the unemployed.

For too long, this country has been divided into two economies. There is the first-class one, where there is a boom, fancy cars, good clothes, and worry about yesterday's Dow-Jones closing stock average.

And then there's the other economy—of hunger and hate and unemployment. Those of us in the first class section had better start opening the doors.

THE USIA—AN INFORMATIVE REPORT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the U.S. Information Agency recently filed its 26th semiannual report to Congress.

In the foreword, Leonard H. Marks, who this month observes his first anniversary as Director of the USIA, states:

As man's ability to create weapons of ultimate terror becomes more widespread, we who inhabit this small planet must devote more of our energies to the critical race between communication and catastrophe.

Philosophically and factually, the report presents the activities of the USIA in telling America's story to the world. The facts and figures are impressive: USIA has, during the period of January through June 1966, broadcast 845 hours weekly in 38 languages to an estimated worldwide audience of 25 million daily; exhibited its motion pictures to 350 million people in 120 countries; placed its television programs on 2,082 TV stations in 94 countries; produced 400,000 leaflets and pamphlets a week in 47 languages for use in 115 countries; published more than 1,300,000 copies per month of 24 magazines in 29 languages for distribution in 90 countries; assisted foreign publishers to produce 6 million copies of 799 different books, including translations; operated 223 libraries and reading rooms, which were visited by over 12 million people.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Marks states in the report:

As I consider the past year, I find no reason to change the basic philosophy which I brought to this assignment. It is expressed in five words: "truth is our best propaganda."

Two other items of particular interest are accounts of dollar savings in USIA activities and of efforts to strengthen foreign language skills of USIA officers.

I invite the attention of the Senate to this report in the belief that they also will find it informative.

DEATH OF C. E. WOOLMAN, FOUNDER AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF DELTA AIR LINES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Nation was saddened by the death Sunday of C. E. Woolman, founder and chief executive of Delta Air Lines.

In his untimely passing, Georgia lost one of its finest citizens and the airline industry one of its great pioneers. He will be sorely missed by his loved ones, friends, and associates.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Woolman's obituary in Monday's edition of the Washington Evening Star be printed in the RECORD.

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

C. E. WOOLMAN, CHAIRMAN, FOUNDER OF DELTA AIR LINES

ATLANTA, Ga.—Recently, C. E. Woolman presented a 20-year service pin to one of his employes and said, "You've done well for a girl who started out in the trash basket."

The employe had nearly forgotten her first meeting with her boss in the early 1940s when she walked into the office and in her nervousness became entangled with a waste paper basket.

Mr. Woolman had not forgotten.

That incident typified Mr. Woolman, a pilot who founded a small crop-dusting firm in 1925 and watched it grow into Delta Air Lines, seventh largest air carrier in the world.

Mr. Woolman always tried to keep in close touch with his employes. When he died yesterday, one of the first telephone calls to the home office here was from a Birmingham, Ala., porter who started with the company in 1934.

MAIL-LOADING RECALLED

"Me and Mr. Woolman used to load the mail together," he said.

Mr. Woolman, 76, died in Methodist Hospital at Houston, Tex. Death was attributed to a heart attack. He had been making a satisfactory recovery from abdominal surgery Sept. 4.

Survivors include two daughters, Mrs. Sam Preston and Mrs. Martha Taylor, both of Atlanta; a sister, Mrs. Rachael Woolman Simpson of Urbana, Ill.; a niece, Mrs. Delmer Murphy of Wilmington, Del.; and five grandchildren, all of Atlanta.

Funeral services will be held tomorrow morning at the First Presbyterian Church in Atlanta and burial will be in Atlanta's Arlington Cemetery.

BOARD CHAIRMAN

Mr. Woolman was elevated to the chairmanship of Delta's board and to chief executive officer last year. He had been company president and general manager.

He was born on the campus of Indiana University, the son of a college physics professor. He spent most of his younger life, however, on the University of Illinois campus, an institution he attended.

In 1910, he worked his way across the Atlantic on a cattle boat to attend the world's first aviation meeting in Rheims, France. It was this event to which he attributed his leaning toward aviation.

In 1925, after serving as a county agricultural agent and managing a 7,000-acre plantation in Louisiana, he founded a crop-dusting firm to combat the boll weevil that threatened the South's cotton economy.

THE ELECTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday the people of the Government-occupied sections of Vietnam dealt a shattering blow to the Vietcong.

Yesterday, the people of the Government-occupied sections of South Vietnam gave Ho Chi Minh one of the worst defeats of his life.

Yesterday, the people of South Vietnam who were free to vote moved a giant step in the direction of popularly elected, constitutional government.

Yesterday, the people of South Vietnam in areas where they could vote reinforced the faith of Americans who have all along believed that the people of that wartorn land wanted nothing more than freedom to make their own way and to build their own country.

Yesterday, Mr. President, the people of South Vietnam went to the polls, where the polls were open, giving them a chance to vote.

They went in overwhelming numbers. If the latest reports are correct, over 80 percent of the eligible voters in that portion of South Vietnam where the polls were open, cast their ballots for their choice of candidates to a constituent assembly.

It was not an easy thing to do. It was not easy for the voters—and it was not easy for the candidates.

The candidates ran for seats in the Assembly at the risk of their lives. Many of the voters cast their ballots under the same threat.

The Communists had set out to use every technique of violence at their disposal to make the elections impossible. Their entire propaganda apparatus of the Communists in South Vietnam and in Hanoi and in the rest of the Communist world was directed to discourage participation in the voting.

Candidates received threatening phone calls and letters. And some were visited by Vietcong agents. The message was simple—and brutal: pull out of the election, or you will be killed. Yet, of the more than 500 candidates, not 1 withdrew his name because of this harassment.

The people were threatened, too. Vietcong agents fanned out through the countryside. They called at village houses in the dead of night. And the message was repeated and repeated again: Do not vote.

But the people did vote. When election day came, they trooped to the polls in huge numbers. They rode buffaloes, and they walked. They rode buses. They used every available means of transport. But they got to the polls—more than 4 million of them.

And even as they went to vote, the Vietcong kept up the pressure. Down in the Mekong Delta, it is reported this morning, a hundred voters or more were walking down a road to vote. The Vietcong opened up with sniper fire. The people ducked. Three of them were hit and died on the spot, according to reports, but the rest kept going, and they voted.

In an off-year election, we can expect about 39 percent of our eligible voters in the United States to turn up at the polls. And no one is shooting at us. So when more than 80 percent of the eligible Vietnamese appear at the polls when they were open in South Vietnam, freemen here and everywhere can only be filled with wonder—and with pride at the courage of another people in a faraway place.

I wonder, Mr. President, what Ho Chi Minh is thinking this morning. What happens now to his claim that the Communists represent the voice of the South Vietnamese people in the Government areas? What does he now tell the young men from the North whom he has sent into South Vietnam? What does he now tell those he promised would be welcomed as "liberators"? For the overwhelming voice of the people of the free areas of South Vietnam has spoken. And it has said: "We do not want you. We want to rule ourselves."

Yes, Mr. President, the people of the South Vietnam areas not under Vietcong control have taken an important step in the direction of building their own political life.

But let us remember that it is but a step, not the entire journey. The new Assembly has the responsibility for writing a new constitution. Next will come the creation of executive and legislative

organs to conduct the day-to-day business of government. And we can expect elections for those new political institutions early next year.

There are as yet no national political parties—around which the loyalties of men and women, and the political life of the South Vietnamese can be assembled. This is another major task that lies ahead.

We who remember our own history know the travail and the difficulties we passed through in shaping a nation and in developing the parties and the institutions of government that met our needs and our desires. This is the work of decades, not of months.

So let us be patient with our South Vietnamese friends—for they have hard work ahead and a long path to travel.

But yesterday, they moved ahead down that path—with courage and with hope.

Let us ask ourselves whether this would have been possible yesterday if the role we have played had been different.

Without the wisdom of a determined President—without the sacrifice of brave American men—without our military and economic assistance—would there have been an election in any part of South Vietnam yesterday?

The answer is obvious to us all.

So let us take new heart—let us take hope—that the basic course we are pursuing is the right one, even if there are individual mistakes and tragic misunderstandings.

For we are helping a brave and determined people—a people who want to be free to make their own choice. I believe that we are making progress, and if we do not escalate this war into Cambodia or North Vietnam, peace may be closer than we think.

Let us hope that day is near.

NATIONAL REDWOOD PARK A BIT NEARER TO REALIZATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Thursday, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and I jointly announced at a press conference that the lumber companies in northern California, operating in the proposed National Redwood Park areas, had all voluntarily announced that they would not cut any redwoods in such areas.

Congress may therefore proceed in its next session to consider Redwood Park legislation as recommended by the President.

All conservation groups are agreed that a National Redwood Park is in the national interest. There is, however, disagreement on size and location.

I made a statement last Thursday on this matter, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL

The public interest of the American people is well served today and the cause of sound conservation has been advanced. We are a little nearer to the creation of a Redwood National Park because of the volun-

tary action of the lumber industry. Congress may proceed next January to consider Redwood Park legislation. Meanwhile, the giant and ancient trees in the proposed park sites are in no danger.

Miller Redwood Company has agreed to stop cutting the redwoods from along the south boundary of the Jedediah Smith State Park. It will simply carry on its logging operations in other parts of its properties, which is all we sought at this time. It has agreed that until Congress has had a reasonable time to act on Redwood National Park legislation, it will not cut in the prime areas of aged virgin redwoods. It will not shut down during this period; no one will be out of a job.

To their great credit, the redwood companies which operate in the area proposed by the Sierra Club for a park have announced that they will voluntarily, and at no cost to the American people, adjust their cutting operations so that the park value of the Redwood Creek watershed will not be defaced pending action on a Redwood National Park bill. These companies are Georgia Pacific Corporation, Simpson Timber Company, and Arcata Redwood Company.

In its telegram to me this morning, Georgia-Pacific Corporation stated:

"It has been the long-standing policy of Georgia-Pacific Corporation that the special interests of the Corporation, its employees and their families must be sacrificed if the national interest requires it." I salute it.

Miller-Rellim apparently will cut about 100 acres of what it describes as "non-park quality" trees this winter, but it has agreed to consult with the National Park Service on the location of this cutting. It has also agreed to consult with the Chairmen of the House and Senate Interior Committees before moving back into the prime stands about which I have been concerned over recent months.

As the Chairman has indicated, we can look toward early passage of a Redwood National Park bill in the next session of Congress. Areas of disagreement still exist on where and how big the park should be. The Save-the-Redwoods League, the National Audubon Society, the California Division of the Izaak Walton League, the National Geographic Society, Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, and other distinguished conservationists favor the bill which I introduced on President Johnson's recommendation. Governor Brown of California also favors this bill. The good people of the Sierra Club and other conservation organizations favor a vastly larger park located in a different area.

I believe the national interest requires a great Redwood National Park for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people. I also believe that the national interest requires the conservation organizations of this country to set aside their differences and to agree on a park site which will do justice to the majesty of these centuries old trees, while protecting the timber-based life and economy of the north coast region of my State of California.

HOW NEW MEXICO SCHOOLS ARE USING FEDERAL FUNDS TO MEET LOCAL NEEDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the September 1966 issue of the NEA Journal there appears over the byline of Mr. Byron Fielding an article entitled "How New Mexico Schools Are Using Federal Funds To Meet Local Needs."

This article is an excellent review of the program being carried out in one of our great States. I was particularly struck by the comment Mr. Fielding reports from a local superintendent to the

effect that "I have never seen a Federal program implemented so quickly. Title I is the best thing that has happened to education in this State."

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks because I feel that it can be most helpful to my colleagues when later we consider amendments to Public Law 89-10 at the time S. 3046 comes before the Senate.

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

HOW NEW MEXICO SCHOOLS ARE USING FEDERAL FUNDS TO MEET LOCAL NEEDS

In the summer of 1965, no one in the U.S. Office of Education or in the various state departments of education could say exactly how Title I of the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL 89-10) was going to work. The \$1.16 billion Congress authorized for Title I had to be used for projects that would meet the special educational needs of "educationally deprived children." Each eligible local school district was notified of the maximum amount of funds available to it under a formula based upon the number of educationally deprived children it had and the average educational expenditure per child in its state. It was left up to the local school district to submit project applications for approval by the state department of education, which was then empowered to make grants within the limit of the maximum amount of funds available to the particular district.

The big problem in New Mexico, as elsewhere, was preparing the local school districts to submit projects that would be acceptable for Title I support. Local school officials were uncertain about whether the law was to be narrowly construed, requiring projects that would involve deprived children exclusively, or whether it would permit flexibility, allowing for such general improvements as increased library services and reduced class sizes. To compound the problem, Congress was late in appropriating funds, so that superintendents did not know until after school had opened last fall how much money their schools would be eligible for or where they were going to find the additional staff they would need to carry on the proposed projects.

Fortunately, Charles H. Wood, late executive secretary of the New Mexico Education Association, had anticipated many of these problems. As early as May, he had prepared and distributed a booklet giving a complete description and analysis of PL 89-10, with an accurate estimate of how much money each district in the state would be eligible for under the Title I formula.

The booklet also contained lists of suggested projects for helping educationally deprived children.

"As an organized profession," NMEA said in the booklet "we believe that the state agency and the administrations of local school districts do not have the full responsibility for carrying out the provisions of this Act. Teachers and those on the firing line should take an active part in developing programs and helping implement the Act."

After schools let out for the summer, NMEA field people and the two NEA West Coast representatives held a series of conferences throughout the state with local association leaders and others to prepare teachers for participating in Title I planning.

Similar meetings for superintendents throughout the state had been called by State Superintendent of Schools Leonard J. DeLayo. Mr. DeLayo, incidentally, had cancelled all summer leaves for the state department staff so that they could study the guidelines published by the U.S. Office of

Education and interpret them for the local school districts. (The state superintendent and his staff have since been commended by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, not only for the speed with which they brought the benefits of Title I to the children who need it, but also for "the imagination and enthusiasm that prevades the entire program" in New Mexico.)

As a result of this kind of preparation, eighty-nine of New Mexico's ninety eligible school districts during the past school year had one or more new programs supported entirely by Title I funds. The funds have been used to supply children with everything from new library books to the eye glasses some of them need to read the books.

"I've never seen a federal program implemented so quickly," says a local school superintendent. "Title I is the best thing that has happened to education in this state."

Because of New Mexico's "three cultures"—Indian, Spanish, and Anglo—Title I projects have had to be tailored to meet a variety of local needs.

Take the matter of teaching reading skills, for example. Practically every district is using some Title I money for development of reading skills. West Las Vegas, a predominantly Spanish speaking community, is using the Miami Linguistic Series, which was originally developed to teach reading skills to Cuban refugee children. Bloomfield, which has a number of disadvantaged Navajo and Anglo children, as well as Spanish, has been using *Words in Color* to teach early reading skills.

Pecos, one of the smallest school districts in the state, used Title I money for quite a different purpose: It purchased a four-wheel-drive school bus to bring children to school from a remote, poverty-ridden community in the Sangre de Cristo Mountains. The only road into the community is a dirt logging road which snow, rain, or even a slight drizzle can make impassable for conventional vehicles.

An interesting Title I experiment is taking place in West Las Vegas, in grades one through five, where Spanish is being taught to pupils whose first language is Spanish.

"The children's Spanish is not very good, though," says the teacher, Humberto Gurule. "We want the children to be truly bilingual, but how can we expect them to become literate in English if they are illiterate in their own language?"

Although Mr. Gurule uses an audio-lingual approach in his teaching, he also puts a great deal of stress on proper grammatical usage and vocabulary building. Knowing that young children can become easily bored with grammar and word drill, a visitor to Mr. Gurule's class is pleasantly surprised at the hand-waving - eagerness-to-answer atmosphere in the class.

Ray Leger, the youthful-looking, bilingual superintendent, credits this enthusiasm not only to Mr. Gurule's patient teaching methods but also to the delight the children take in being able to use their own language at least one period a day. "It is helping many of our children see for the first time that their own tongue may be used as a medium of instruction," he says.

Other teachers have also commended on the favorable side effects of the elementary Spanish classes. The children who have been taking Spanish seem to find it easier than before to learn other subjects where the instruction is given in English.

In addition to the elementary Spanish classes, West Las Vegas has sixteen other Title I projects, ranging from a course in auto mechanics to music lessons. Music is emphasized because it is as much a part of the children's Spanish heritage as their language.

"We want the children to be proud of their heritage so that they will have pride in them-

selves," says Litra Romero, the district's music director for the past fifteen years.

Under Mr. Romero's direction, West Las Vegas has begun its first organized music program for the elementary schools. He has also arranged for teachers from nearby New Mexico Highlands University to give lessons in folk dancing, as well as in stringed instruments and piano. All of this comes out of Title I money.

"There is certainly no lack of flexibility in what can be done with these funds," says Superintendent Leger.

This high degree of flexibility was consciously encouraged by the state's Title I coordinator, Mildred K. Fitzpatrick. In helping local school districts plan their proposals, Dr. Fitzpatrick purposely provided no models. "We didn't want to discourage anyone from experimenting with anything that he thought might work in his particular situation," he says.

The great leeway in using Title I funds to nowhere more evident than in the Central Consolidated School District No. 22 in the northwest corner of New Mexico. Central Consolidated takes in some 4,800 square miles of Navajo Reservation; more than 85 percent of its students are Navajo Indians, who for the most part still lead the same pastoral existence that they did in the days of the Spanish governors.

The typical Navajo child suffers not only from the primitive and harsh conditions of life on the reservation but also from an almost total lack of familiarity with the English language and from isolation from the greater society beyond the reservation. Merely getting him to come to school is often difficult, for many Navajos have not yet fully accepted the values of formal education.

In order to give the Navajo child an opportunity for an education that will mean something to him, Central Consolidated is spending more than \$465,000 in Title I money for a project on arts of communication that begins at the pre-primary level and carries on through high school. The project includes construction of such facilities as a reading and listening skills center, a language laboratory, and an eight-room pre-primary building, which should be ready this month.

In addition, Title I provides badly needed supplementary school health services and two well-balanced meals a day to supplement the Navajo child's monotonous diet of mutton stew. The school health program is run in cooperation with the United States Public Health Service, which has found among Navajo children diseases ranging from tuberculosis to sight-destroying trachoma.

Finally, the school district has sought to spread the word among the Navajos about these new Title I projects, in drawing up the district's proposals, Assistant Superintendent Wallace Cathey made provision for hiring an attendance officer and a Navajo interpreter. The attendance officer is not an old-fashioned truant officer but a college-educated, fully certified teacher. "His job is not to threaten but to inform," says Mr. Cathey.

By having someone to keep track of all the Navajo children in the district, the school system hopes not only to cut the high rate of absenteeism among the Indian youngsters but also to get parents of four- and five-year olds to enroll their children in the noncompulsory pre-primary classes.

Keeping track of all the Navajo children in the school district is no mean feat, however. The Navajos, who are believed to have one of the highest birthrates in the world, have only in recent years attempted to keep accurate birth records. Furthermore, because of perpetual drought and pastureland depleted by centuries of overgrazing, the Navajos have to move frequently in search of new grazing land and watering places for their sheep.

If this were not enough, some Navajo children are in the habit of changing their names whenever it suits them. Thus, at the beginning of a new school year, a fourth-grade teacher may have to go to last year's third-grade teacher to find out who "Richard Begay" or "Joe Garcia" really is as far as his school record is concerned.

The hiring of the attendance officer has resulted in substantial reduction of the absentee rate among the school district's 2,000 Navajo children. The public schools are even getting children they never knew were in their district before, like the eleven-year-old boy who recently showed up in school for the first time.

Until about ten years ago, less than one-fourth of the Indian children in New Mexico were in the public schools. The majority attended schools on the reservations run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and various churches. These schools had the disadvantage of (a) being mostly boarding schools, and (b) being totally segregated and, therefore, not giving the Indian child contact with children living off the reservation.

In order to permit Indian children to attend public schools with non-Indians, the federal government compensates needy public school districts for taking children from non-taxable Indian lands. The policy of the BIA and some churches is to provide schools only in areas not served by the public schools. Nevertheless, in some places they continue to accept children for whom public schooling is available.

"A lot of people seem to think that the Indians prefer having their children educated separately," says William Dwyer, superintendent at Jemez Springs. "The truth, I think, is that they would rather have their children in the public schools if they were sure their children would not be discriminated against."

Jemez Springs has an enrollment that is about 25 percent Pueblo Indian, and Superintendent Dwyer is using the district's Title I money in ways that he hopes will encourage more Indian parents to send their children to the public school. "I'll take any Indian child who wants to come here," he says.

The emphasis at Jemez Springs is on pre-primary education and language arts. The pre-primary program is designed to get the Indian child at an age when he is receptive to learning what for him is a foreign language and to mixing more easily with non-Indian children. The program has one group coming in the morning and another group in the afternoon with both groups at school together for lunch, which is free.

In order to have an integrated program, Dwyer permits nondeprived children to enroll in the pre-primary groups, provided their parents pay for their lunch and transportation. To keep these children out of the program, Dwyer believes, would be to discriminate against the Indian children.

During the first few weeks of the pre-primary program, a number of mothers came from the Jemez Pueblo to see what the school was up to. Many have since come back to thank Superintendent Dwyer for what the school is doing for the children. Some even stay to assist the two pre-primary teachers on a voluntary basis.

An unexpected dividend, Superintendent Dwyer feels, is the responsibility his upper elementary students have assumed for the four- and five-year olds in the pre-primary. In the school cafeteria, one sees the older boys and girls hurrying through their own lunch so they can help the small fry (who eat afterwards) with their trays.

Much to the superintendent's satisfaction, the governing council of the Jemez Pueblo recently passed a resolution urging the Bureau of Indian Affairs to close its school in their area and allow all the students to

September 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21381

transfer to the public school. Even though the recommendation has not as yet been followed by the BIA, it was looked upon by Superintendent Dwyer and his staff as a vote of confidence in what they are trying to do in their Title I programs.

In practically every Title I project mentioned thus far, teachers have been involved from the earliest planning stages to direction of and participation in the program. This involvement has been, to a great extent, the result of the five regional meetings held by the New Mexico Education Association in the summer of 1965. An average of 250 teachers and administrators attended each of these Title I briefings so that they could be prepared to offer not only suggestions but also to take part in the actual planning of projects.

An outstanding example of the kind of teacher involvement NMEA encouraged is the way Title I has worked in Tucumcari, a district with some 3,000 students, which is spread out over a vast area of eastern New Mexico.

When Warren Nell took over as the new superintendent at Tucumcari last fall, one of the first things he did was authorize the appointment of a Title I steering committee. Headed by Albert Thornberry, a sixth-grade teacher, the committee polled fellow teachers on what they thought were the most urgent needs of their disadvantaged students. The almost unanimous choice as the number one need was for a reading skills program at all levels above grade 3. Next came expanded health services, more counseling, and elementary physical education, which few New Mexico districts have been able to afford.

Acting as a coordinating group, the steering committee then set up subcommittees of teachers in each area of need, and at each level, elementary, junior high school, and high school. The district's lone school nurse headed the subcommittee on health services. The task of the subcommittees was to draw up proposals, including the kinds of facilities and equipment needed as well as the estimated costs. Except for the clerical work and some other details handled by the superintendent's office, all work that went into Tucumcari's Title I proposals was performed by teachers and principals, much of it in the evenings and on their own time.

Because of the lateness in receiving Title I funds last year, none of the proposals could be put into action until midyear. This posed quite a staffing problem in Tucumcari, as it did in many school systems. Although the superintendent had teachers who were eager to take part in their own projects, he was reluctant to take them for fear of disrupting the regular school program.

Relying instead on finding new teachers among midyear college graduates, he was able to recruit a number of young teachers of "surprisingly high quality." These included a reading specialist with an M.A. plus twenty hours in her field, two young physical education specialists, and several others with specialized training.

"Although it accounts for only 8 percent of our budget, Title I has changed our whole program," says Superintendent Nell.

Title I has also made a significant change in the relations between the public schools and St. Anne's, Tucumcari's parochial school. In explaining Title I to various groups in the community, the superintendent assured officials at St. Anne's that their 100 or so children from impoverished families would not be discriminated against. In his Title I proposals he made provisions not only for having a counselor and some of his new teachers spend part of their day at the parochial school, but also for equipping a classroom at St. Anne's for a small-group, reading-skills program. The only condition was that all equipment, books, and other materials would remain the property of the public schools, as PL 89-10 requires.

Every piece of equipment Tucumcari purchased, with Title I money, including tables and chairs, bears a red plastic tag with white lettering that reads, "Tucumcari Public Schools Title I." The tags are Superintendent Nell's way of saying, "Title I is for all disadvantaged children, no matter where they go to school."

BYRON FIELDING.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

THE ELECTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I want to address myself for a few moments to the question of the election held on yesterday in Vietnam.

Much is written in the press and spoken over radio and television about things which go wrong. It seems to me that we should talk a little humbly and calmly about things which happen to go right.

The events which transpired in South Vietnam on yesterday, in the form of their voting for membership of a constituent assembly, falls specifically into the latter category.

I can remember listening on the floor of the Senate to the many critics of our general position on Vietnam. They were sounding the note of alarm only a very few months ago that there should be an election, and then when the election was ordered they were saying that it probably would not come off or if it did the election would be loaded, or something would be wrong with it.

I think there is enough of a record now to take quiet satisfaction not only in the fact of the election but also in the way it was conducted. To the best of my knowledge, until now, there is no measurable complaint as to any serious infractions or violations on the conduct of the election. When we bear in mind the circumstances under which it was conducted, it is all the more a tribute to the South Vietnamese people that they should have turned out in such large numbers under the grave risks they ran with the terrorist incidents. It bears good testament to the fact that they were at least willing to edge their way along toward a more representative process in the government of their country.

It is important not to jump to any dangerous conclusions that this will solve the problems of Vietnam. We are entitled to caution ourselves, and to assess the implication of the events of yesterday in the quietest of terms.

The election is a landmark. It is an important step forward. We should be proud of what has taken place in that regard. It is the culmination of a significant year, of great changes, and most of them for the better, in that part of the world.

It is a landmark election because, as many will recall, it looked as though Vietnam had really gone down the drain when the drive of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese was pressing dangerously close to cutting South Vietnam in

half at its narrow waist. But this situation was reversed because of the rapid buildup of the American presence there, and since then, the Members of this body who have been critical of the U.S. position in Vietnam have retreated from one excuse to another to find more cause to lament our presence there.

At one stage, the critics thought that we should stop the bombardment in order to invite a conference. We have done this twice. But that was not enough to satisfy the critics. They stated that the next step was that the government of Premier Ky would not hold together, that it was a totalitarian regime which could not command law and order or the support of any semblance of the people of South Vietnam.

In fact, when I was in Vietnam for the third time last April, in the midst of violent demonstrations, it was evident then that the demonstrations in Vietnam were more serious to the United States because of their interpretation here than they were in Vietnam at the time.

In any event, those troubled days last April, May, and early June, have long since disappeared into a far more stable and settled configuration. The regime of the existing Government seems to be riding very well at the moment.

The significant thing is that great steps have been taken for the better—and that is one of them.

At the same time, during my presence in Vietnam last April, the great concern was about inflation. Quietly, significant anti-inflation steps have been taken by the Vietnamese Government which are now beginning to show up on the constructive side of the ledger.

There is also a change in attitude among the many countries in that part of the world. There has been great headshaking in this Chamber about the fact that the rest of the world seems to be critical of us.

I have said on many occasions that we are not trying to run a popularity contest in Vietnam, that during the past century, when the world was experiencing its greatest stability, "perfidious Albion" was the best that could be said of the British on whose shoulders the responsibility for that order in the world had largely fallen.

We are not trying to make this a popularity crusade, or an "everyone loves America week," because of the role which history has thrust upon us in trying to restore some kind of stable balance of power to the world.

Even so, let us not lose sight of the fact that in this part of the world, largely in South Vietnam and east Asia in general, there has been a substantial shift in the climate of opinion. That shift is not without a real record of action as well as of words among the leaders of those countries, and in actions by the countries themselves.

In that connection, I invite the attention of the Senate to a discussion between a distinguished American columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, and the President of the Philippines Ferdinand Marcos, who is shortly to arrive in this country. When President Marcos was asked what he

thought of the presence of the United States in southeast Asia in this crisis, he replied:

Of course it has been worthwhile. At first I was against sending our combat troops to fight in Vietnam because we in the Philippines were not sure of the firmness of the U.S. will to stick it out. Our doubts have now been wholly removed. The U.S. has made abundantly clear its determination to maintain its presence there.

The point that President Marcos made is the point that can be made in every capital in that part of the world, which has been hanging over the capitals of Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, and even Cambodia, if you will, as well as the Philippines; namely, the great question mark of American intentions, the great doubt as to whether America really meant what it said in the wake of World War II. It seems to me that we have removed all reason for those doubts. We have removed the question mark which has been hanging heavily over the policymakers of southeast Asia during the past year. As a consequence, not only the Philippines shifted their basic position during the past year, but so have other leaders in that part of the world. The Thais are in a much firmer position now than they were a year ago, whereas in many of the provinces in Thailand, their villages were being invaded by thousands of guerrilla cadres sent by the Red Chinese. That remains a threat, largely because the Chinese have had no new bases from which to purchase materiel, and no new sources from which to resupply. Therefore, it has been curbed. It has been held in check only because of the American presence in Vietnam.

Let me add, Mr. President, that the same judgment is held in regard to the sudden and fortuitous turn of events in Indonesia. As the President of the Philippines has observed on that point, largely because of the presence of the United States in Vietnam, the doubters in Indonesia, those who were not sure which side to turn to, which group to play with, had their doubts removed. Our presence in Vietnam did, in fact, according to President Marcos, make the difference in this turn of events in Indonesia.

The Premier of the government of Singapore, Lee Kuang Yew, has further declared—although he has not been altogether friendly to our cause most of the time—that if the Americans were to pull out of Vietnam, his government and that of his neighbors would be immediately placed in jeopardy, and while he would hope that someday the Asians could reconsider their own balanced structure in that part of Asia, until they were capable of doing so, the American presence in Vietnam was an indispensable part of a more peaceful and stable future in that part of the world.

Burma, as to which we have received a great deal of criticism, refused to accede to the importunings of Peking to censure the presence of the United States. Burma refused to do it because of the change in opinion and the firm U.S. presence. Within the past few days Ne Win has been in this country, visiting President Johnson.

So these are some of the benchmarks in the last year that spell out the critical changes in attitude, opinions, and positions in the countries which are critically important to what is going on in southeast Asia.

I inject that along with the election in Vietnam because they all show that we are indeed moving ahead. We are indeed improving our position. We are indeed conditioning a more favorable climate for ultimately a peaceable settlement of the differences in that part of the world.

Let us remember, however, it must be a two-way street. Even so, the conditions make it more possible and there are emerging more clearly evidence that the people want to resist aggression, that they believe in independence, that they believe in the lawful processes, rather than a resort to aggression to achieve their goals.

These are the trends of today, and with the election in Vietnam yesterday we have another evidence of a climate that gives us hope that we will be successful in the kind of goal we are trying to achieve, in order that the Asians will have a chance to put their house in order. If we do not help them preserve that chance, no one else there is going to have an opportunity to do so.

So I want to pay my own salute to the Vietnamese for the limited but significant undertaking exhibited in their country yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask that editorials on the Vietnamese elections from the New York Times and the Baltimore Sun, as well as newspaper columns on our successes in Asia by Roscoe Drummond and Joseph Alsop be printed in the RECORD.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 12, 1966]

SAIGON'S ELECTORAL VICTORY

The elections in South Vietnam were a success for Marshal Ky's Government and indirectly for the Johnson Administration. According to present available figures, three-quarters of the eligible voters cast ballots. This far exceeds Vietnamese and American hopes before election day.

The victory deserves full acknowledgement, but its effects should not be exaggerated. Candidates were merely elected to an assembly which will draw up a constitution leading to still another election in 1967 or 1968 for as representative a government as the situation and political backwardness of the people will permit.

Since large regions of South Vietnam are under Vietcong control, or subject to the Vietcong's threats, the election could not lead to a genuine popular majority. But, insofar as the South Vietnamese people, at this stage of their history could record a democratic vote, they have done so.

Marshal Ky, himself, has been an in-again-out-again candidate for the office of an elected president, but it is obvious that any future government would have to be either military or, if civilian, willing to prosecute the war. The conflict will go on pretty much as if the election, despite its undoubted value and success, had not taken place.

Hanoi's inflexible rejection of President Johnson's offer of a mutually agreed withdrawal of troops from South Vietnam shows

that neither the time nor the circumstances are ripe for negotiations or a truce.

The block on the road to peace has been made clear again and again by both sides, as is was in the recent exchange. The United States says that Hanoi is the aggressor and North Vietnam says that Washington is the aggressor. Behind the simple accusations are all the complex forces of power politics, ideology, nationalism and emotions that make the war in Vietnam so stubborn and, for the moment, so intractable.

Yet, the effort to solve it and to bring about negotiations must go on. The United States cannot assume that Hanoi literally means, and always will mean, exactly what it says today. North Vietnam may one day accept the fact that the United States really intends to withdraw from Southeast Asia when circumstances permit, and Hanoi may also hope that the American escalation of the war will not continue to a point of no return.

In the diplomatic game that goes on behind the crack of guns and thunder of bombs, the ideals for which the United States stands gained a point in yesterday's election. The Vietcong, the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists lost by the same margin. The war goes on, but it has been proved that three out of four of those who could vote in South Vietnam braved danger and future risk to do so, and thereby expressed either support for or acquiescence in what the Saigon Government is trying to do.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
Sept. 12, 1966]

VIETNAMESE VOTING

Premier Ky said last week that the success of yesterday's South Vietnamese elections, the results of which may remain unknown for several days, cannot be measured "on a percentage of voters." He said also that not many of the voters understand what they would be voting for. As to the first point, it is but partly true. If the vote had been small, the chances that the elections would be taken by the South Vietnamese, and by others elsewhere, as the faint beginnings of popular government would have been seriously dimmed. As to the second, it may be true that most voters had no more than a faint notion of what the balloting is about.

In a way it is no wonder. The election is a complicated arrangement, set up not to choose a government but to name the members of a constituent assembly which will be charged with writing a constitution. Once that is accomplished, if it does get accomplished, a government is to be elected, some time next year, under the constitution's terms. What those terms will be no one can say now—except that they will not be displeasing to the present ruling military junta, which has drawn the procedures in such a way as seemingly to guarantee for itself a power of veto over any portion it finds contrary to its own thinking.

Further to confuse the voters, Premier Ky has said, in contradiction to earlier statements (which themselves sometimes contradicted still earlier) that he may run for the presidency next year after all. To a good many Vietnamese who dislike military regimes this will sound like a declaration of intent by the military to stay in power, no matter what.

Other confusions are many. Some of them arise simply from the rules laid down for the campaign that led to the voting. These were elaborate and peculiar. The campaign was sharply limited in duration. Candidates were restricted in the time allowed to address such crowds as showed up to hear them, and the candidates for each place had to appear together. Then there was the boycott announced by the more militant Buddhists, the effect of which still today remains uncertain.

September 12, 1966

Then, and even more seriously, there were the acts of violence undertaken by the Viet Cong to hinder the voting, and perhaps just as effective, the hints and threats of violence. Some possible voters were certainly so intimidated that they refrained from going to the polls. How many cannot be known, today or later.

Yet for all the complications, vagueness and dangers, this election was worth holding. Not to have tried to move at all, now, in the direction of popular government would have been worse than to move in this way, tentative though this way is.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 11, 1966]

OUR ASIAN ALLY—PHILIPPINE PRESIDENT HAS PRAISE FOR U.S. POLICY
(By Roscoe Drummond)

Americans will soon have in their midst a brave Asian ally and a superb advocate of the growing will of more Asian nations to unite in defending themselves against Communist aggression.

He has earned the esteem and respect of Asians and Americans alike. He will address a joint session of Congress on Sept. 15 and will speak to the United Nations a few days later. I believe he deserves to be heeded, whether one is a supporter or critic of United States actions in Vietnam.

The Asian spokesman is the young president of the Philippines, Ferdinand E. Marcos. In advance of his speeches in the United States, I wish to cite some of his views and insights which are not widely known.

Question. How do you think Indonesia escaped the attempted Communist coup?

President Marcos. It was only the American presence in Vietnam, I feel, which prevented the fall of the Indonesian Government into Communist hands. Not only Indonesia, but also other countries.

Question. Why do you feel this is true?

President Marcos. The Communists supposedly plotted an effort to prevent a take-over by the enemies of President Sukarno. But it actually was an open and outright coup to take over the government. It was planned a long, long time ago. The situation became such that the Communists were certain, were very certain, not only of internal support but of support from outside.

Question. What intervened?

President Marcos. When the American Government decided to increase its aid to South Vietnam, that knocked out all previous assumptions. But by then, the Communists had begun the initial moves of their operation and it was too late for them to pull back. And very few people know this.

Many leaders who were wavering in Indonesia immediately realized that the Communist coup was going to fail. Also, with large U.S. forces in Vietnam, the Red Chinese would not have either the capability nor the inclination to send any help whatsoever to the Indonesian Communists. And that is exactly what happened.

Question. Then you think the United States action in Vietnam has been worthwhile?

President Marcos. Of course it has been worthwhile. At first I was against sending our combat troops to fight in Vietnam because we in the Philippines were not sure of the firmness of the U.S. will to stick it out. Our doubts have now been wholly removed. The U.S. has made abundantly clear its determination to maintain its presence there. (The Philippines will soon be sending combat forces to Vietnam.)

The American presence goes far beyond the effect on the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong. The fight which the Communists refer to as the "fight for national liberation" is the single most important thing that will determine the state of affairs in Asia for the next century. You can hardly imagine what

might have happened if there had been no demonstration of resolution on the part of the United States.

Question. Would it be helpful to have Red China in the U.N.?

President Marcos. Unfortunately, as of now, the leadership of Red China is not willing to renounce war as an instrument of international policy.

To be eligible, she must be willing to live peacefully with her neighbors. When she is prepared to do so, let her leaders say so—and act so.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 9, 1966]

MATTER OF FACT: DIVIDENDS ON VIETNAM POLICY

(By Joseph Alsop)

BANGKOK, THAILAND.—It is high time for someone to speak out, loud and clear, about the great success already achieved in Asia by the American effort in Vietnam. This does not show at home, where all eyes are upon the harsh, always continuing war. But it stands out a mile here in Thailand, in the aftermath of General de Gaulle's strange and haughty Asian oration.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and his sympathizers used to warn the country, in hollow, tragic voices, that the American intervention to defend South Vietnam would make every Asian an enemy of the United States. If these warnings had not been wholly misleading, Eastern Asia should now be resounding with acclamations for de Gaulle.

Instead, the de Gaulle speech has been sharply condemned by the usually cautious Japanese; and in every other Asian country not aligned with the Communists, the speech has either been sharply condemned or simply treated as unworthy of comment. Nor is the response to de Gaulle anything more than the superficial symptom of a truly profound change in the Asian outlook.

The able Foreign Minister of Thailand, Thanat Khoman, summed up the change very succinctly. "A year and a half ago," he said to me, "there seemed to be no doubt at all that we should soon be faced with a Communist-controlled axis running from Indonesia to North Korea, and including the whole of Vietnam, Cambodia and eventually Laos. The pressure on the other Asian countries would then have been all but irresistible, and in some cases it would not have been resisted."

"That threat has vanished, now, and it can never be revived if the American effort in Vietnam is successful in the end, as I am sure it will be. Instead, the non-Communist Asian countries are now moving further and further towards forms of cooperation, even partnership, which have great promise for the future."

The Foreign Minister's colleague at the Development Ministry, the astute and experienced Pote Sarasin, put the matter even more concisely. Vietnam, he said, had been the decisive test, both of America's willingness to live up to American commitments and of the much-vaunted prospects of general Communist victory. "Suppose you had done differently," he continued. "Everyone is now convinced that the future does not lie with the Communists."

"But if you had done differently, it would be just the other way around. And in Indonesia, for instance, the sensible leaders would not be in any position to try to save their country from ruin, as they are now doing. Instead, everyone in Djakarta would be saying that Bung Karno was dead right all along."

A few days ago, the courageous Indonesian Foreign Minister, Adam Malik, also happened to pass through Bangkok. Throughout a long and absorbing afternoon's talk about Indonesian problems and hopes, there were always two underlying assumptions.

The first was that the Indonesian Communists would have won in the end somehow, if the United States had left the Vietnamese to their fate. And the second was that the Indonesian future must still in a considerable measure depend upon a successful outcome in Vietnam.

There is much other evidence of the same sort, ranging from Seoul to Manila, from Rangoon to Singapore, where the position taken by the brilliant leader, Lee Kuan Yew, is particularly significant. In Asia, more than almost anywhere, politics are governed by an acute sense of the trend of events; and except for the eccentric Prince Sihanouk in Cambodia, Asian leaders see the trend today, not as de Gaulle sees it, but as Pote Sarasin sees it.

That does not mean, however, that we can take the Asians for granted, even if the time comes when our effort in Vietnam has succeeded. On the one hand, we cannot permit ourselves to indulge in the kind of arrogant outrage typified by Senator FULBRIGHT's proposed investigation of American activities in this country.

Here is a country that has given the United States every kind of assistance imaginable and with the freest and most generous hand, all on one signed condition, that this assistance should not be too publicly discussed. It is not going too far to describe Senator FULBRIGHT's plan to hold public hearings on these matters as a plan for giving aid and comfort to the enemy. If we want allies, we must treat them as equals.

Even if we manage to refrain from such self-righteous provocation, we must be prepared for surprises and even for shocks if and when we have succeeded in Vietnam. The main motive for the Asian cooperation that is being pushed by Foreign Minister Thanat is to assure the independence of the Asians, eventually including independence of the Americans. No doubt this independence may later be manifested in distressing ways. But the wiser Americans will take these manifestations as proofs of our success.

MRS. MARY T. BROOKS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3553) for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Brooks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

HUDSON RIVER BASIN COMPACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been requested by the majority leader to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1556, H.R. 13508, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to consideration of the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is the first time I have had any notice that this bill would be brought up at this time. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether it has been considered by any committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. Is this the measure known as the Ottinger bill with relation to a compact?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes; this deals with a compact between the State which the Senator from New York so ably represents, and New Jersey, the State of which I am the junior Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. When was it reported to the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It was reported to the Senate by unanimous vote of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on September 8. There was one request to hold up consideration on the Senate floor which was made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. Let me frankly say that I, too, did not know the bill would be brought up today, but the Senator from Vermont is satisfied and has no reason to object either to its consideration or to passage of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since I have had no notice concerning this bill, I have to say now that I will object, but I may not have to do so necessarily later. I suggest at this time that the Senator from New Jersey withdraw his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I must confess I thought the bill would be considered on Wednesday. I came into the Chamber at 10 minutes of 1—and it is now 1:25 o'clock p.m.—and only then learned that the majority leader wanted this bill called up.

I withdraw my request for consideration of H.R. 13508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, reams have been written, volumes of words have been spoken as to the reason for the poor showing of this bill.

Before debate proceeds any further, and for the record, I want to make a few remarks that are not directly on the contents of the bill but go to the dis-

cussion and some of the points about debate.

I firmly believe that the poor showing of the bill, so far, is because the people are against it; that is, the rank and file of the people across the Nation are against the bill. They will be against it in the forthcoming elections this year. In the years to come, the more they understand the bill, the more pronounced will be their opposition to it.

The average person still believes that he has some rights of his own under our system of government whether he be white or black or brown. He believes that some of his basic rights have been forgotten in this pellmell rush of agitation and competition among those in public life for the passage of a civil rights law by Congress on every conceivable subject. The white citizen knows that he is not only forgotten, but that he is the target of this bill. The white citizens all over this Nation realize this fact and most of them have had enough. Further, they have gone to saying so. I believe they will continue to say so, at the polls this year and next year and in the years ahead. As supporting evidence of my conclusion on this point, I cite the major change in this bill in the House of Representatives when the proponents of the measure were forced to agree to an amendment making the housing provisions thereof applicable to only 40 percent, as estimated, of the housing sales throughout the Nation. Various reasons were assigned for this change in statute, but the basic reason was the people back home have been heard from. There was great opposition, as I say, to the bill from the rank-and-file people.

The filing of amendment to the housing section and agreement to it by the proponents of this measure entirely abandoned the idea of the alleged principle upon which the bill was supposed to have been drawn. That amendment eliminates, as estimated, from the operation of the bill about 60 percent of housing transactions which occur in the United States in the course of a year's time. Thus, it was an act by the proponents of the measure in which they joined, at least, which repudiates the policy of the bill as expressed in title IV, section 401, which states:

It is the policy of the United States to prevent discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the purchase, rental, lease, financing, use, and occupancy of housing throughout the Nation.

Further evidence of my conclusion on this matter is the almost total lack of interest in the present Senate debate.

Further evidence supporting this conclusion is that in each instance during the last several years when the people have had a chance to vote on this proposition of open housing they have voted it down by a substantial margin.

After laying down those very fine words as a policy, the measure as it comes to us turns around and immediately eliminates 60 percent of housing transactions in the Nation, and to that extent entirely abandons the policy written on the face of the bill.

That is an admission that it is not an alleged principle they are fighting for here. This is a political measure pure and simple, designed, not by all, perhaps, but designed by many, of those who are pushing it to the limit to get votes at the forthcoming election this year and in years thereafter. The only reason in the world they abandoned such a major part of it was that the backfire of the opposition to it was too great from the people back home. This backfire comes from areas outside the South, where we have felt so much of the impact of the other civil rights bills that have been enacted.

Further evidence of my conclusion as stated on this subject is the almost total lack of interest on the subject in the present Senate debate.

In my humble opinion the spectacle that the Nation has been given of trying to place the entire blame on the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] for defeat of the bill has been pitiful. He stands on his own feet. He resists pressure. I commend him for it highly. But the idea, either from a party standpoint or the standpoint of a group of Senators, or from any other standpoint, of trying to bring the crushing weight, the politically devastating weight by some on his head because he has been firm and unyielding is a tragedy in the political affairs of this Nation.

I say that the reason why the bill has not moved and the lack of interest is due to the opposition to having it enacted.

Further evidence to support my conclusion is that in the past several years, when the people of the Nation have had a chance to vote on the proposition of open housing, they have voted it down by a substantial margin. That applies to local elections, not to national elections, where the issue was sharply drawn. I refer to local elections not in one area, but in areas throughout the Nation.

I have been a Member of the Senate for some time, but I consider myself by no means wise in this matter or any other matter; however, there is no doubt in my mind that the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 is purely a political measure, drawn, presented, and urged for the purpose of getting votes from minority groups in the elections of 1966, in the elections of 1968, and in the years thereafter. If this bill is passed—although I do not believe it will be—we will see the same drive for the use of implied power to impose a code of conduct on the people of the Nation with respect to housing as is being imposed now in the South as to public schools, under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

For that reason, I want to make some references directly to the power being used under some of the language of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, particularly as to schools. I am using it as an illustration because almost the same language to which I shall refer is also found in the bill as to housing.

When we passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 we did not know what claims would be made, what the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would do, or what the Department of Justice

I feel a personal sense of grief in his passing. For more than 25 years it was my privilege to have a close personal relationship with this great man and to be the beneficiary of his wise counsel and his unselfish assistance to me in many ways.

Our close friendship resulted in part from his lifetime acquaintanceship with members of my immediate family and the mutual esteem in which they held each other. I shall always remember with gratitude the many very personal relationships that I was privileged to have with Mr. Dickson which meant so much to me in so many ways.

The sense of loss which I feel is felt by countless others who were the beneficiaries of his good works. As a business and financial leader of the Nation, he was of great assistance to many struggling business organizations. As a humanitarian, he contributed much to the hospitals and educational institutions of the North Carolina area. As a friend of the average man, he was constantly giving alms to his less fortunate brother without ostentation.

Rush Dickson's life touched so many facets of human activity that I could not commence to detail them in this short statement. In a broad way, however, an editorial writer for the Charlotte Observer on Sunday, September 11, 1966, dealt with the life and works of this wonderful man. I submit this editorial for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD today:

RUSK DICKSON LEFT BUILDER'S MARK

Rusk Smith Dickson, who pulled himself up by his bootstraps to become a financial giant and a man of great influence, was the kind of person George Bernard Shaw expressed admiration for in his play, "Mrs. Warren's Profession," written in 1893.

"People are always blaming their circumstances for what they are," Shaw wrote. "I don't believe in circumstances. The people who get on in this world are the people who get up and look for the circumstances they want, and if they can't find them, make them."

Rusk Dickson did just that. He was born in a log house on a farm near Grover, son of a strict disciplinarian who appreciated property and its values. Chances are that Rusk Dickson would have become a successful farmer and businessman even if his eyes had not seen beyond his own community, but he made no little plans.

From the beginning of his awareness of the world around him and its opportunities for personal and business growth, Rusk Dickson wanted to make his own way. He combined ambition, hard work, thrift and self-discipline to rise from his humble beginnings to head one of the nation's top 50 investment securities firms.

When the Charlottean was honored by the Newcomen Society at a dinner here in 1961, the then-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, his old friend Emery B. Denny, said: "Rusk Dickson is the living embodiment of the competitive element in the system of private enterprise."

Rusk Dickson had his critics, detractors and enemies. He was a hard-nosed businessman who stood with Gibraltar-like resolve when he thought he was right in a personal, business or political matter, and nobody is right all the time. But thanks to his ability to see business investment matters clearly and realistically, hundreds of businesses in these Piedmont Carolinas have begun and succeeded, thousands of jobs have been created and scores of municipal and county governments are stable.

In addition to his financial genius and ability to build productively, Rush Dickson gave much of himself to state and community life. His long service to Charlotte Memorial Hospital was especially noteworthy. The two fundations he created have done immense good.

Family and friends knew a side to this man that the public saw but rarely. They understood the beat of the drum he heard, the one that drove him to the pinnacle of financial success. But they knew him, too, in softer and less compulsive moments, as a man capable of compassion and other emotions that do not dominate the market place.

Many financially successful Charlotteans with small-town or village beginnings saw something of themselves in Rush Dickson, and something of the novelty and opportunity of this land and this people. There was much of Cornelius, Clover, Concord, Gaffney, Mount Holly, Grover and Gastonia in his life story, and the people there still identified with Rush Dickson when he died last week at 71.

He made no small plans because he knew they would not move him or others. By setting his goals high, he prospered, but more important, he built for the benefit of many. It was the good fortune of Charlotte and the Southeast that he came to be among

Congressman Roudebush Exposes U.S. Professor's Denunciation of U.S. Vietnam Policy While Traveling on Federal Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, Congressman RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, of Indiana, has discovered that an American professor who recently bitterly denounced U.S. Vietnam policy while visiting in Moscow had made his trip on Federal funds.

The professor, from the University of California, had also been active in antiwar protests and was cochairman of the Berkeley campus Vietnam Day Committee last year.

This professor made his denunciation in front of North Vietnamese press correspondents while in Moscow to attend a mathematics conference. He also has been granted money for further travel expenses in 1967. We may well wonder where this professor will turn up next to attack his own country, unless the National Science Foundation heeds Congressman ROUDEBUSH's recommendation and cancels the 1967 grant.

The following story from the September 12, 1966, Indianapolis Star describes this shabby affair and Congressman ROUDEBUSH is to be complimented for his work in uncovering the facts of the case:

PACIFISM LAID TO U.S. VISITOR TO MOSCOW

WASHINGTON—An American professor denounced United States policy in Viet Nam while on a Moscow visit financed by the Federal government, a congressman said yesterday.

Representative RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH (R-Ind.) identified the professor as Stephen Smale of the University of California.

The congressman said Smale also had been co-chairman of a Viet Nam Day Committee that organized antiwar protests at the university's Berkeley campus last year.

Smale, ROUDEBUSH said, called North Vietnamese correspondents to a press conference last month in Moscow and there criticized U.S. policy in Viet Nam.

Smale was in Russia to attend a mathematics conference, the congressman said.

ROUDEBUSH said the professor drew \$2,778 a month in Federal funds as salary during the summer and also drew \$1,000 for a round trip jet fare from California to Moscow under a Federal grant.

"I don't believe the American taxpayers should be saddled with the expense of sending a professor on a three-month European junket to issue statements in Moscow running down the policies of the United States government," ROUDEBUSH said in a statement.

"If he wanted to travel at personal expense we couldn't officially object, but taking \$13,000 in tax money to visit Moscow and rap America is too much."

ROUDEBUSH said he had requested a complete report from the National Science Foundation regarding details of the grant awarded Smale. He said the foundation had made a \$91,500 lump sum grant to the University of California and it selected Smale for a \$13,000 grant for salary and travel expenses in 1966 and 1967.

Thus, he said, Smale is due to receive \$6,000 next year. ROUDEBUSH indicated he would recommend that the National Science Foundation cancel Smale's 1967 grant.

Congress in Need of Modernization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, ours is a constantly changing society and it is proper and necessary for the Congress to assess from time to time its organizational structure and procedures.

I have been enthusiastic over the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which has issued a valuable set of recommendations on improving the methods of operations in Congress. The joint committee report is a good one, though some important problems were not included in it.

An analysis of the importance of a modern Congress was made in an editorial by Paddock Publications, Inc., publishers of 17 suburban newspapers in the 13th Congressional District, Illinois. The editorial of September 1, 1966, follows:

CONGRESS IN NEED OF MODERNIZATION

Adjustment to changing needs of society is essential to effective operation of government.

With the ever-increasing reliance placed on the federal government to meet needs of its citizens, that is particularly true of Congress. Yet Congress has failed to adjust to modern conditions. It continues to operate in the same basic format it did a generation ago.

Final report of the Joint Committee on Organization of Congress was issued four weeks ago. It resulted from 16 months of study during which the joint House-Senate committee heard nearly 200 witnesses—congressmen, congressional employees, political scien-

September 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4751

Under the plan, postmasters and rural letter carrier jobs would be filled as a result of examinations conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

The top three candidates making the highest scores for the particular job would be submitted to the Post Office Department. Candidates who are disabled veterans would get top preference.

The postmaster general would have the right of final selection, but this would have to be on the basis of the three names submitted to him by the CSC.

In effect, the system would be the same as for career job appointments in other government departments and agencies.

The administration feels that the proposed new system would save it and Congress the countless headaches in appointing postmasters and rural letter carriers.

As one official put it, "Under the present system, for every friend you make, you make 100 enemies who did not get the job."

Civil Service Commission officials feel the proposed new system would improve the quality of postmasters by encouraging outstanding leaders of a community to apply for the job.

The proposed new system would not apply to present postmasters and rural letter carriers.

As a matter of fact, CSC officials say that the quality of present postmasters and rural letter carriers is uncommonly high.

The CSC's standards have been high and in a majority of cases one of its top three candidates certified to the department has been the person selected.

But the CSC feels the new system will encourage even better-qualified candidates to compete for these jobs, in the knowledge that merit and not politics will be the deciding factor in all cases.

Agriculture Department Ignores "Small Farmer"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has ignored one of its most important jobs, which is to get the income of the small farmer up to a decent level, not drop the family farmer as an economic liability.

I quote a statement made by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, John A. Schnittker that "Federal farm policy is aimed at achieving parity income for adequate size commercial farms, not necessarily for small farms."

Schnittker defined as "adequate" those farms grossing over \$10,000 a year in sales.

This statement is typical of the abuse and misuse which the administration has made of the agricultural segment of the Nation's economy.

According to farm census figures just released, South Dakota lost an average of 1,205 farms per year in the period 1959 to 1964.

It is very apparent that the Johnson-Freeman administration is ready to ignore the family farmer completely. The long-range plan for the American producer evidently does not include 29,000

South Dakota farmers—or more than 58 percent of them—whom the Department considers as "small farmers."

The Secretary of Agriculture should denounce this irresponsible statement and take effective action to reverse this record of failure and neglect which the statistics clearly reveal.

Payments to Dentists for Insurance Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives, H.R. 17638, a bill which will make mandatory the inclusion in health insurance policies issued by companies doing interstate business, a provision requiring that payments shall be made under these policies to doctors of dental surgery, doctors of dental medicine, and oral surgeons for the performance of surgical procedures where the contract permits payment for these procedures to a doctor of medicine.

Unfortunately, some insurance contracts have been narrowly construed by the companies issuing them so that necessary surgical procedures involving the mouth and jaw of affected patients have to be performed by a medical doctor, and if performed by a dentist, no payment is made. In my opinion, this unnecessarily restricts the freedom of choice of patients, and should not be permitted.

This problem has been met in California by a supreme court decision interpreting a health insurance contract so as to include within the term "medical doctor," a dentist when performing surgical procedures otherwise covered by the contract.

North Carolina and West Virginia have passed legislation similar in purpose to my bill.

These surgical procedures consist of fractures of the jaws, biopsies of the tissues of the mouth and jaws, tumors, and cysts of the mouth and jaws, frenum operations, incisions in and about the mouth for acute infections in the soft tissues and jaw bones, surgery for correction of deformities and malrelation of the jaws, X-rays of the teeth and jaws, avulsion of branches of the fifth nerve in cases of tic douloureux, removal of salivary stones, correction of dislocation and disturbances of the maxillary condylar joint, alveoplasty and stomatoplasty of the mouth, incisions of the tongue, lips and palate, and so forth.

There are good national precedents for this legislation; namely, the Federal Employees Health Benefit Act of 1959—Public Law 86-382, S. 2162, September 28, 1959—and the recent Health Medicare Insurance Act—Public Law 89-97, H.R. 6675, July 30, 1965.

In the Government-wide indemnity benefit plan, covered by Aetna and other

associated insurance companies, under the heading "Definitions of Terms Used in This Brochure," is the following wording:

Doctor is a duly licensed doctor of medicine (M.D.) or a duly licensed doctor of osteopathy (D.O.). The term includes surgeons and other specialists if they meet this definition. A duly licensed dentist is also considered a "doctor" for purposes of the dental work and oral surgery covered by the Plan, and a duly licensed podiatrist (chiropractist) is considered a "doctor" for purposes of the foot conditions covered by the Plan. Types of practitioners not specifically mentioned above are not considered "doctors" for purposes of this Plan.

In the Government-wide service benefit plan, administered by Blue Cross and Blue Shield, under the title "Definitions of Terms Used in This Brochure," is the following wording:

Physician is a doctor of medicine (M.D.) or doctor of osteopathy (D.O.) who is legally qualified and licensed to practice medicine and perform surgery at the time and place the service is rendered. For services covered by the Plan, doctors of dental surgery (D.D.S.), doctors of medical dentistry (D.M.D.), and doctors of surgical chiropody (D.S.C.), when acting within the scope of their licenses, are deemed to be physicians. No practitioners other than those specified above shall be deemed to be physicians for purposes of this Plan.

In Public Law 89-97, under Title I: Health Insurance for the Aged and Federal Assistance and subheading "Physician," is the following wording:

(r) The term "physician," when used in connection with the performance of any function or action, means (1) a doctor of medicine or osteopathy legally authorized to practice medicine and surgery by the state in which he performs such function or action (including a physician within the meaning of section 1101(a)(7), or (2) a doctor of dentistry or dental or oral surgery who is legally authorized to practice dentistry by the state in which he performs such function but only with respect to (A) surgery related to the jaw or any structure contiguous to the jaw or (B) the reduction of any fracture of the jaw or any facial bone.

This definition with respect to physician has been upheld by the Supreme Court of some States—notably a ruling by the Arizona State Supreme Court regarding the right of a dentist to administer a general anesthetic, wherein the court ruled that in fact a dentist was a physician.

It is my understanding that considerable attention is now being given this matter of vital importance by several States.

Rush Dickson Left Builder's Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 8, 1966, our State of North Carolina and the Nation lost an outstanding leader when Rush Smith Dickson departed this earthly life.

Post Office Committee to become Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce—a committee which, of course, is very important to West Virginia.

With the kind of representation you have in Congress, it is no surprise that a new building has been constructed to house the Post Office and other federal agencies which serve the people of this area. As has been said previously, more goes into a building like this than just bricks and mortar.

What President Johnson refers to as a "consensus" is an essential part of the blueprint for a building like this. Before this fine new structure could be built there had to be a meeting of minds between Congress and the Executive Branch of government.

It is, of course, as Mayor Armentrout said, a recognition of your economic progress. I was most pleased as I came into Parsons today to see, for example, that your woolen mill is developing its capacity. We know that the new charcoal plant has also added to Parsons' payroll.

You may have noticed that we on the platform have been going through some rather unusual gyrations. It is because we have had a number of yellow jackets flying around up here on the platform. I trust that the Senator and Congressman do not think you are putting the bee on them for another building.

While these new facilities are being built because the efficient handling of mail requires them, the construction of a new federal building also helps the economy of the area where it is located. This is a most welcome "fringe benefit."

At our present rate of construction, we are building about 900 new post offices a year. That's a lot of new post offices, but when you consider that we have approximately 34,000 post offices throughout the nation you can understand why we have a constant demand to replace outmoded facilities.

The United States Post Office Department is a tremendous operation. For instance, we operate a fleet of more than 50,000 motor vehicles and more than 100,000 of our employees are on the road every working day. These employees travel over 4 million miles a day, which is more than eight round trips to the moon.

All of this activity is devoted to one purpose—delivering the mail. And the size of our mail load is almost unbelievable. Our country is in the midst of an unprecedented mail explosion. On any typical day the Post Office Department of the United States processes as much mail as the rest of the world combined.

This year we will process almost 80 billion pieces of mail, which represented an increase of 5½ per cent over the previous year's volume. Right now our mail volume is running 6 per cent ahead of last year's record figures. This means that over the past two years our annual volume has increased by 7½ billion pieces of mail.

Naturally, no one ever sees our entire volume of mail—all 80 billion pieces at one time. In fact, I suppose it is even difficult for anyone to visualize what a figure like 80 billion really means. I know it is for me. When I try to picture the tremendous size of our mail volume I think of the country lady whose family took her to the seashore for the first time. She had heard a lot about what a huge body of water the ocean was, and as she stood looking out at the horizon one of her sons asked her what she thought of the ocean.

"Well, really," she said, "it's not as big as I thought it would be."

Records have become commonplace in the Postal Service today—records for mail volume, records for miles traveled, records for man-hours worked, records for just about every aspect of our operation. I would have to guess we even set a record every year for the number of employees bitten by dogs.

Speaking of dog bites reminds me of the story of the letter carrier who was bitten by a rabid dog. He was taken to the hospital and after an examination the doctor told him he might get rabies.

"If that's the case," the carrier said, "I'd like a pencil and some paper." He started writing and after he was at it for some time the doctor said: "That's a pretty long will you're making out."

"Will!" the letter carrier said. "That's no will. It's a list of the people I'm going to bite."

The building of new post offices is just one phase of a broad program to improve mail service.

We are taking steps to revitalize every aspect of mail processing and delivery—to move the Postal Service into the 20th century. Far-reaching changes are necessary if we are to carry out President Johnson's mandate to us to give the nation the best mail service in its history. And Postmaster General O'Brien has made it very clear that he will accept nothing short of meeting the President's goal.

The major thrust of the changes we are making in the Postal Service is toward mechanization. We are obtaining the most modern, the most efficient, the most advanced mail handling machines American industry can produce.

The machines we are installing to handle this postage deluge are being used to sort mail, stack it, place the addresses in the same direction, cancel stamps and "read" ZIP Code numbers.

Naturally, it is practical to install these highly specialized and expensive mail processing machines only in major mail handling centers. But I want to stress that our mechanization program will mean better mail service for every post office patron, no matter where he lives or how often he uses the mails.

The quicker we can process mail at the big volume post offices where most of it enters the mail stream, the quicker it will be delivered, regardless of where it is headed.

I'd like to emphasize one other point about our mechanization program—a point I know is of concern to Senators RANDOLPH and BYRD and Congressman STAGGERS because of their interest in the welfare of postal employees. The machines we are installing are not going to cost any postal employee his job. Our mail volume is increasing so fast we are going to need the help of every employee we have, and more, to handle it.

In the next year we expect to recruit about 50,000 employees. Although most of these employees will be needed in larger urban communities, we must have qualified workers and we are taking steps so people in smaller cities and towns can take examinations for appointment to postal jobs in large cities nearby.

We are proud of our employees and we know they can get the job done no matter how great the volume of mail, if we give them the modern tools they need. Our mechanization program is giving them the tools. But even with the best work force and the most modern machines, there is still one other ingredient indispensable to efficient mail service—and that's cooperation.

We must have the cooperation of everyone who uses the Postal Service, from big businesses which send out millions of pieces of mail to the individual citizen who sends just a few personal letters. We need the cooperation of everyone in using ZIP Code.

I can't urge you too strongly to use the correct ZIP Code number in the destination address and return address of every piece of mail you send.

ZIP Code and mechanization are part of our program to modernize the Postal Service from top to bottom. So is the new post office we are dedicating today. It is a small step in the overall picture—but a vital one. Its dedication marks the forging of another

strong link in our chain of improved postal facilities and services.

I'm sure it will serve you well. And I know Postmaster Hehle and his employees will continue to reflect credit on the Postal Service.

It is a pleasure to dedicate this new post office and federal building to fill the needs of the people of the Parsons area.

Grateful appreciation is expressed to all of the following for their civic leadership and sense of deep community responsibility in making this program possible:

Parsons Volunteer Fire Department; Boy Scouts of America, Troop; 97; Parsons Woman's Club; Holly Meadows Farm Women's Club; Quoda Club; Flanagan Hill Farm Women's Club; Women's Auxiliary, Parsons Fire Department; River City Club; Kiwanis Club; Lions Club; Elkins Highlander Band; Parsons High School Band; Local Merchants, Bakeries Serving Parsons, Industries of Parsons.

Federal Agencies Represented by: Lorraine Barrick, Selective Service; Leona Thompson, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service; Harold Matlick, Soil Conservation Service; Paul Natale, Forest Service; Maxine Nestor, Parsons Post Office.

Post Office Employees: Charles F. Barbe, Assistant to the Postmaster, Maxine Nestor, Clerk, Earl J. Delaney, Clerk, William H. Sheets, City Carrier; Paul S. Mauzy, Sub. Clerk-Carrier; Ford Fink, Sub. Carrier; Robert Bozic, Sub. Clerk; John W. Howater, Custodian; Edward C. Simmons, Janitor; Claud S. Sturm, Star Route Carrier; Norine Hedrick, Star Route Carrier.

PROGRAM

Mr. Hubert B. Lake, Master of Ceremonies, President, The Tucker County Bank.

Mr. Stanley A. Hehle, Postmaster.

1:30 p.m.: Band Concert, Parsons High School Band, Guy A. Saporito, Director; Elkins Highlanders, Chester Phillips, Manager.

2:00 p.m.: Invocation, Rev. Meade L. Gutshall, First Methodist Church; Introduction of Mayor; Welcome to Parsons, Mayor Forrest Armentrout; Introduction of Distinguished Guests; Introduction of Honorable David Phillips, Regional Administrator, General Services Administration; Introduction of U.S. Senators; State Senator J. Kenton Lambert; The Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, State of West Virginia; The Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, State of West Virginia; Introduction of Dedication Speaker, Honorable F. Alvin Webb, Regional Director, Washington Region, Post Office Department; Dedication Address, The Honorable Frederick C. Belen, Deputy Postmaster General, United States of America; Presentation of Flag, The Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, U.S. Congressman, Second Congressional District, West Virginia; National Anthem, Parsons High School Band; Benediction, The Rev. Acie H. Bryant, First Presbyterian Church.

3:00 p.m.: Open House—Everyone invited.

Salinger Tells How Kennedy Tried To Hide Vietnam Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, there are many questions about our involvement in Vietnam which demand honest answers. Among these questions is:

Appendix

Deputy Postmaster General Belen Dedicates U.S. Post Office and Federal Building at Parsons, W. Va.—Praises Work of Senators Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd, and Representative Harley O. Staggers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as ranking majority member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and chairman of its Post Office Subcommittee, I have monitored with interest the drive toward better service which is underway in the Post Office Department. Under the capable direction of Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, significant advances are being made to insure that the delivery of the mails is accomplished through the most rapid, dependable and economical means.

I have noted with gratification that modernization efforts include the construction of a number of new postal facilities which will make possible improved handling procedures. One such facility is the U.S. Post Office and Federal Building in Parsons, W. Va., which was dedicated on Saturday, September 10, 1966. The principal address on this important occasion was delivered by Deputy Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen. Approximately 600 persons were in attendance.

In his comments, Mr. Belen pointed out that West Virginia and the Parsons area are fortunate to be represented in the Congress by such able leaders as Senators JENNINGS RANDOLPH and ROBERT C. BYRD, and Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS. He gave special commendation to Senator RANDOLPH, my colleague on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for his efforts in the passage of recent legislation which provides improved parcel post service. I echo these words. There is no abler or more effective member of the United States Senate than my cherished friend JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Mr. Belen went on to indicate that mail volume in this year is expected to reach the astounding figure of 80 billion pieces. He assured his listeners, however, that the Department was hard at work finding new and better methods for moving this record total. The Deputy Postmaster General said, in part:

The building of new post offices is just one phase of a broad program to improve mail service.

We are taking steps to revitalize every aspect of mail processing and delivery—to move the Postal Service into the 20th Century. Far-reaching changes are necessary if we are to carry out President Johnson's mandate to us to give the nation the best mail service in history. And Postmaster General O'Brien has made it very clear that he will accept nothing short of meeting the President's goal.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Belen for these words of assurance to the mailing public, and take this opportunity to indicate that I shall continue to labor in the Senate of the United States to assist in bringing these goals to reality.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address by Deputy Postmaster General Belen at the dedication of the Parsons, W. Va., U.S. Post Office and Federal Building be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL
FREDERICK C. BELEN, PARSONS, W. VA., SEP-
TEMBER 10, 1966

It is a pleasure to join you today for this happy occasion and to extend to you the personal greetings of President Johnson and Postmaster General O'Brien.

Other than dedicating a post office at Lansing, Michigan, where I was born and grew up, this is as close as I could come to unvelving a new post office in my home town. My ties to Parsons are deep and strong, and if a man can be said to have two home towns, then I qualify as a native. In any event, I am a native by virtue of affection, if not by birth. And, believe me, Opal and I appreciate this welcome home.

As has been emphasized, my wife is from Parsons. I've been visiting this community and this State for almost 25 years. I've done quite a bit of fishing in West Virginia's many beautiful lakes and streams, and although I bow to no man in my belief in conservation, I must admit I've taken a lot of fish from West Virginia waters.

It has been said the difference between catching fish and bragging about it later is about four to ten inches per fish. That cynical observation notwithstanding, I've caught some big ones here.

If I hadn't known about West Virginia before I came to the Post Office Department, I would have learned quickly, for many natives of your State are in positions of major responsibility in the Post Office Department and all of them have made valuable contributions to the postal service.

A West Virginian, Alvin Webb, is the director of the Washington Postal Region, which includes West Virginia as well as Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia, and he is here with us today. So is Carson Browning, formerly Postmaster at Logan. Carson heads our Postmasters Division.

We also have with us today Slim Bright, a native of nearby Keyser, who tackles some of our most difficult personnel problems with much success. Slim is no stranger to the Postal Service, his father having spent 40 years as a Railway Postal Clerk.

Whenever my duties take me away from

Washington, I make it a point to talk to as many postal employees as I can. They are the men and women on the firing line. Better than anyone else, they know where we are succeeding and where we need to improve postal service. I appreciate the attendance of so many of you today.

My pleasure at being able to take part in the dedication of this new Parsons Post Office is greatly enhanced by the fact that I am sharing the platform with three distinguished representatives of this State, for whom I have the utmost admiration and respect—Senators RANDOLPH and BYRD, and Congressman STAGGERS.

It has been my privilege to work closely with these outstanding national legislators.

When I came to Washington in 1937 to work for a Michigan congressman, our office was across the hall from JENNINGS RANDOLPH'S, who was then a member of the House of Representatives. Since then, I have come to know him well and my admiration for him and for what he has accomplished for West Virginia and the nation has grown steadily through the years.

Although I left Capitol Hill in 1961 when President Kennedy appointed me Assistant Postmaster General, I did not lose contact with Senator RANDOLPH. Since then our paths have crossed often. He is a member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I have testified before the Committee often and have had numerous occasions to confer with him on postal matters.

I am sure the occasion Senator RANDOLPH referred to when he questioned me before his committee was when I testified on the subject of increasing the size and weight of parcels permitted to go in the mails. I want you to know that we, in the postal service, were delighted with the solution that was worked out for this legislation. Parcels up to 40 pounds and 84 inches can ultimately be sent through the mails between first-class post offices. Instead of a sharp change, the committee provided for a gradual change over five years. This pleased both the Railway Express Agency and its employees, and the employees of the railroads who had expressed concern. Chairman MONRONEY, Senator RANDOLPH and other members of the committee are entitled to a great deal of credit for working out this solution.

I can assure you he is very well informed on the postal service. He knows our problems and he has been extremely helpful to us in our endeavors to build a more efficient mail delivery system.

With West Virginia's other Senate seat in the very capable hands of ROBERT BYRD, this State can boast of two strong and respective voices in the U.S. Senate. We in the Post Office Department appreciate the support we have received on important postal matters from Senator BYRD.

This Congressional District is thrice blessed, for it also has an extremely able spokesman in the United States House of Representatives. With my close ties to Parsons, I consider HARLEY STAGGERS my congressman. I trust he won't object to my joining his constituency.

You may know, at one time Congressman STAGGERS was my boss, when he was a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and I was its staff director. I was impressed then with his effectiveness, and my esteem has increased since he left the

A4747

September 12, 1966

A4749

Are the American people being adequately informed about the conduct of the war in Vietnam?

According to a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report, former Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger indicates in his new book, "With Kennedy," the lengths the administration went to in order to conceal moves that put the United States deeper and deeper into war in Asia. It has been alleged that questionable information policies relating to Vietnam are continuing in effect.

I introduce for the RECORD at this point the U.S. News & World Report article of September 12, 1966. The article follows:

SALINGER TELLS HOW KENNEDY TRIED TO HIDE VIETNAM BUILDUP—NOW OUT IN THE OPEN: DETAILS OF HOW KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION HOPED TO CONCEAL MOVES THAT PUT THE UNITED STATES DEEPER AND DEEPER INTO WAR IN ASIA

An account of how American armed forces became actively involved in the war in Vietnam—and how the late President Kennedy tried to cover up such involvement—is given by a former Government official in a new book.

Pierre Salinger, former Press Secretary to both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, is the author. On the basis of his experience in the White House, 1961-64, Mr. Salinger writes in the book, "With Kennedy," published by Doubleday & Company, Garden City, N.Y.:

"When John F. Kennedy became President of the United States, the total U.S. force in Vietnam was about 600. It could be truly said that the United States was acting solely as an adviser to the Government of South Vietnam."

GENERAL'S ADVICE

In late 1961, Mr. Salinger said, the President sent his military adviser, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, to Vietnam for a personal investigation.

The Administration began a gradual buildup of U.S. troops in South Vietnam which—according to Mr. Salinger—"was to reach over 20,000 at the time of the death of the President."

Authorities in Washington decided that "a change was necessary in our policies toward the press in Vietnam," Mr. Salinger continued.

"With the build-up of U.S. troops and supplies, this Government was now going to be engaged in activities which were in clear violation of the Geneva Conference of 1954."

The 1954 Geneva Agreements partitioned Vietnam at the seventeenth parallel into a Communist North and a free South; set limits on the size of armed forces in both areas; and pledged the "neutrality" of Laos and Cambodia. The U.S. did not sign the pact, but agreed to abide by it under specified conditions.

Mr. Salinger said the Communists had been violating the agreement for some time. Nevertheless, he added, U.S. policy makers did not want to admit that the U.S. now was "similarly violating the Agreements." Mr. Salinger writes: "Finally, the Administration, having gone through the Bay of Pigs, and still involved in the Berlin crisis which had caused it to call up the reserves and send extra divisions to Europe, was not anxious to admit the existence of a real war in Southeast Asia."

The Administration sent a directive to Saigon for a new public-information policy in State Department cable 1006 of Feb. 21, 1962, Mr. Salinger said. It called for "cooperation with the press," but also appealed for restraint on the part of correspondents in handling information affecting national security.

Mr. Salinger relates:

"Stories began appearing with increasing regularity describing heavy involvement of U.S. forces in Vietnamese operations, and stories of the shooting down of U.S. helicopters.

"Such articles are frequent now with more than 235,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam [302,000 as of Aug. 30, 1966], but taken in context of 1962-63 operations, they presented the American people with the picture of a widening war in Southeast Asia"—a picture which Mr. Salinger said "the Administration did not want to present."

"President Kennedy was particularly sensitive about some of these articles," Mr. Salinger observed. "It was my view at the time that we should be prepared to take the good stories with the bad in Vietnam, but the President pushed hard for us to tighten the rules under which correspondents could observe field operations in person.

"Those responsible for information policies of the Government were therefore squeezed hard—between the desire of the Administration to downplay the war for a whole variety of military and political reasons, and the desire of reporters on the ground to tell all to the American people."

Several additional attempts were made to lay down guidelines controlling news coverage of the Vietnam war, the Salinger book indicates.

A new press policy authorized by President Kennedy in the spring of 1963, Mr. Salinger said, was in a "secret memorandum" which Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester hand-carried to a strategy conference in Honolulu with U.S. officials from Vietnam. Later, the then Assistant Secretary of State Robert Manning, after an on-the-spot survey of press relations, said in a report:

"The problem is complicated by the long-standing desire of the U.S. Government to see the American involvement in Vietnam minimized, even represented, as something less in reality than it is."

Pierre Salinger concluded:

"There are a number of hard lessons to be learned from the handling of the press in Vietnam between 1961 and 1964. The most important is that, despite all the motivations which exist to the contrary, the Government can never expect success for a press policy which does not rely on total candor."

Indiana Businessmen Protect the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on August 30 I was privileged to attend a luncheon in Washington, sponsored by the Central Indiana Better Business Bureau and the Indianapolis Consumer Affairs Council. Following the luncheon, a special illustrative film presentation showed and described the kinds of voluntary controls practiced through self-regulation by Indiana businesses to educate and protect consumers. An informative and helpful question-and-answer session closed the meeting.

Due to a great deal of recent propaganda from some quarters, it would be very easy to get the impression that the American consumer is little more than a helpless lamb, to be preyed upon at will by the wolves of business. The remedy

suggested for this, of course, is "pass a law."

This luncheon meeting pointed out not only that there are already a host of laws on the books—local, State, and Federal—but there are also ethical codes and general rules of conduct within different trades and businesses themselves, and businessmen band together, place themselves under voluntary self-regulation and restriction, and go to great care to make sure the consumer is both protected in what he gets, and gets what he wants.

I have yet to see any solid evidence that would make me believe the American consumer is a helpless individual, brainwashed by advertising into buying a product or service he does not want. The relatively few consumer complaint letters I receive invariably end with the solemn vow that not only will the individual never buy that particular product or service again, but he will also tell his friends and neighbors what he thinks of it. This is a powerful deterrent to poor merchandise, and the businessman knows it.

What consumer dissatisfaction exists cannot and will not be eliminated by more restrictive legislation which is of doubtful merit to begin with. Educating the consumer to be careful—to be on the lookout for and to be able to identify shabby merchandise and practices—and to use protection which is already available to him is preferable by far. This is exactly what Indiana businessmen are doing, and they are to be complimented for their work in this field.

It is axiomatic, I believe, that the American consumer simply will not buy a product he does not like or want. If there is any question in anyone's mind about this, let me ask: How many Edsel dealers are still in business?

The following article from the August 30, 1966, Indianapolis Star describes the work of the Central Indiana Better Business Bureau and the Indianapolis Consumer Affairs Council:

PACKAGING BILL OPPOSED

(By James A. C. Thom)

If you open a box of Crashle-Crunchies breakfast cereal and find that it is only half full, do you sit there and suffer in silence (broken only by the crushing sound of cereal-chewing), or do you scream for Federal intervention?

Or, if you open a can of Chicken Gumbo and find it tastes more like gum than chicken, do you write your congressman and insist on a law against gummy gumbo or do you just quietly resolve never to buy that brand of gumbo again?

Private businessmen like to believe that you'll just change your brand and find your own way to a better product with an honest label.

Private merchants believe that consumer education and competition are strong enough forces to keep packaging and selling on the up-and-up, without any necessity for calling in the Feds.

Now, the Indianapolis business community for a long time has been a bastion against Federal fiddling in private business matters, so it is not surprising that a group of Indianapolis businessmen is going to Washington this week to try to convince Congressmen that we don't need more laws on ethical packaging and merchandising practices.

Armed with a recently compiled 20-minute slide and tape presentation, the In-

dianapolis Consumer Affairs Committee hopes to show that the consumer already is protected well enough from exploitation, and that he can put the unethical sellers in their place if he knows where and when to complain.

What the committee hopes to influence is Washington thinking on a couple of bills (S. 985 and H.R. 15440). The bills, pretty far along in the law-making process, call for packaging and labeling controls that would limit and specify package size for virtually all grocery products, and would let government agencies regulate the allegedly misleading "cents-off" and "economy size" designations on packages.

The narrated visual presentation is built on the findings of a couple of surveys in the Indianapolis area—one a survey of businessmen and the other a survey of consumers.

The survey among the businessmen indicated that they think their own self-regulation is the most effective kind of control. And that they must regulate themselves to retain public confidence in the competitive marketplace. Fraud and deceit are minimal, they said, because of internal self-regulation within the company's quality control program and such inter-industry influences as the trade associations, the Better Business Bureau and the advertising media.

All local advertisers, for example, are pledged to conform to standards of advertising acceptability set forth in the "Truth in Advertising" book published by the Advertising Club of Indianapolis and the Better Business Bureau. Then there is the "Advertising Code of American Business," which lists nine guidelines which must be followed by anyone advertising in the Indianapolis market.

Also an important influence in this regulation is the use of the consumers' well-voiced complaints. Whether voiced directly to the merchant or to the BBB or trade associations, these complaints usually result in quick remedy of the situation.

On top of all this self-regulation, there is also a powerhouse of legislation existing already—in anti-trust laws, Federal Trade Commission and Food and Drug Administration powers, postal restrictions, and so on; and there is the wide range of local and state laws, the building, plumbing and electrical codes, labeling and sanitation rules, etc.—all of which, this Consumer Affairs Committee believes, make up quite enough legal protection without the writing of more legislation.

The survey among consumers was carried out by Walker Research, an independent local research firm which interviewed 500 Indianapolis area housewives on the general topic of their own complaints about product or service quality.

Their complaints covered a broad spectrum—from dealers who make a sale and then forget the customer when it comes time for emergency service to the auto insurance company that drops its long-time policyholder after his first accident; from watery canned goods to scum-leaving detergents—but the number of dissatisfactions was surprisingly low, the researchers reported.

The committee concluded that further legislation is not the way to eliminate what consumer dissatisfaction there is. Instead, it declared, the answer is in educating the consumer to be careful in the marketplace and to use the protection that is already available. The BBB is working presently to educate the buying masses through newspaper stories and ads and radio and television spots and shows.

And an elaboration of the committee's slide show is to be prepared soon for viewing by consumers throughout Indiana.

So far as is known, say spokesmen for the Consumer Affairs Committee, no other community has prepared an opinion-shaping message of this type for the lawman in Washington, though it does concur with the

regular efforts of the Advertising Federation of America and several other national business-policy groups.

What the committee is trying to support, then, is the idea that ultimately, the customer (not the government) is always right and the businessman knows it—or else.

IRS Put on Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Memphis Commercial Appeal carried a provocative and illuminating editorial in its Thursday, September 8, 1966, edition. It commented upon the offensive action taken by the National Right To Work Committee in responding to a charge by Internal Revenue Service that it had been engaged in political activity.

The National Right To Work Committee is in the same identical situation as any other group that is tax exempt under section 501(c)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code. Section 14(b) is sound legislation, as it permits a person in the 19 States that have right-to-work laws to join or not join a union. It would be well if the working people in all of the States of the Union were accorded the same privilege in earning a livelihood for themselves and their families.

The Commercial Appeal editorial follows:

IRS PUT ON SPOT

As a tax-exempt organization, the National Right To Work Committee is under investigation by the Internal Revenue Service to determine whether it has violated the revenue code by indulging in political activity.

Read Larson, executive vice president of the Right To Work Committee, has now put the IRS on the spot by calling attention to the lax enforcement of similar restrictions on labor unions.

The AFL-CIO retorts that its activities are "strictly within the law," but it would appear that what has actually happened is that the unions have found loopholes in the law.

The issue, of course, is not really political activity or tax-exempt status, but rather whether voluntary union membership is to be permitted to continue in states which have right-to-work statutes.

In 1964 the labor movement mounted a furious attack on Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Act, which allows individual states to retain or enact laws that give workers a choice between joining a union or refusing to join. Big labor avidly supported candidates who promised to work for repeal of 14(b). The labor lobby put heavy pressure on the White House and Congress in the ensuing months, but lost the fight for the duration of the 89th Congress. It was, in effect, a defeat for President Johnson, too. And it was then that the IRS suddenly bore down on the National Right To Work Committee.

Says Mr. Larson: "We are, of course, well aware that as an exempt organization we cannot engage in any political action, and we have scrupulously avoided any involvement in politics or political activities. The only purpose we have is to promote the principle of voluntary unionism."

"But are not labor unions, as tax-exempt organizations under Section 501(c)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code subject to the same restrictions on political activities as the National Committee and other exempt organizations? And if this is so, why is it that labor unions can openly and flagrantly use the monies collected from compulsory membership dues to make contributions to political candidates?"

The issue is clear cut. It makes more plain than ever the need to retain Section 14(b), and to spread its benefits through states other than the 19 which now have right-to-work laws.

It is patently unjust to force a worker to join a union against his wishes, to force him to contribute dues to support a leadership which he himself does not support, and to spend his money in political activity contrary to the individual's political sentiments.

More than that, it is deplorable to see the Administration, through the IRS, twisting revenue statutes in an attempt to still the persistent voice of the Right To Work Committee.

Postmaster and Carrier Removal From Patronage To Be Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated the removal of postmasters and rural letter carriers from politics. On March 14, 1966, I introduced a bill—H.R. 13586—in the House which provides that the Postmaster General shall appoint postmasters under civil service procedures and that no political test or qualification shall be considered in such appointments.

I was pleased that, in its recent final report, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress also recommended removal of these post office appointments from politics.

Now it has come to my attention through "The Federal Spotlight," a column by Mr. Joseph Young appearing daily in the Washington Evening Star, that the Johnson administration is considering asking Congress to remove postmasters and rural letter carriers from the political patronage system. I greet this news with enthusiasm. It would be a proper step in the direction of improved postal service and improved Government.

Mr. Young's column of September 6, 1966, follows:

POSTMASTER AND CARRIER REMOVAL FROM PATRONAGE TO BE SOUGHT

(By Joseph Young)

The Johnson administration will ask Congress next year to remove postmaster and rural letter carrier jobs from the political patronage system.

Administration officials disclose that the proposal will be for postmasters and rural letter carriers to be appointed the same way as other federal and postal civil servants.

Eliminated would be Senate confirmation and the present "character evaluation" system, whereby prospective candidates are screened by the administration before they are cleared for consideration.

September 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4767

Ethel Merman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Ethel Merman, the incomparable star of all media of entertainment, is I am proud to say, my constituent and friend.

Recently in the District of Columbia in the acclaimed revival of "Annie Get Your Gun," she has, in the true show business tradition, given of her time to entertain the war wounded.

A delightful interview, which captures the spirit of Ethel Merman appeared in the Evening Star of August 24, 1966, and I commend it to my colleagues:

MERMAN ENTERTAINS THE WAR WOUNDED
(By Betty Beale)

"What this country needs is more of the big-hearted spirit and world embraceable warmth of Ethel Merman. The minute she walks on the stage it comes over the footlights and hits you in the face," said a Washington admirer.

"This is the kind of woman she is: She turned down a \$5,000 fee here last week to appear on a TV program, yet she devoted a whole afternoon to entertaining the Viet Nam casualties at Walter Reed but wouldn't allow any publicity about it.

"She went out last Thursday did a 45-minute show in the auditorium for the ambulatory cases, then visited three different wards and sang in each for a half-hour. She went to every bed and posed for a picture with each of the boys so they could have them. I bet she didn't even tell you she went," observed the speaker.

No, she had not, said I, who had just finished interviewing her under a hairdryer. It was the only time she had free before the early dinner she has before rushing to the theater.

The incomparable musical comedy star has given the women of America a new lease on life. She has proved that a grandmother can come back in the identical show and identical role in "Annie Get Your Gun" that she starred in 20 years ago and do it better than ever before. She has been wowing Washington.

In a world where some companies won't take on a feminine employee over 40 and retire those they do have at 60, she has proved how wrong they can be.

But this angle never occurred to Ethel. She never thinks about age. She "had no reservations" about playing a romantic role opposite a man obviously younger than herself.

"Everybody tells me they are not conscious of the age different," she said about the hum of the hair dryer. "Even in my personal life I go out with younger people because anybody older could not keep up with me. I always go out with younger people."

"It's the consensus that it's a better show than the first one—productionwise and from every standpoint," she continued.

"I have a whole new audience now because when I did it originally some of these people were not even born. Now I have a whole new following of teen-agers and 20-year-olds. You'd be surprised at the letters I get. They don't even ask for photographs. They just write and say they had heard about this legend and now they have seen it and love it so they just want to say it."

They were talking about Ethel, obviously, but modesty made her phrase it that way. Modesty is a Merman characteristic.

For instance, when she mentioned that Lynda Johnson, accompanied by two White House aides (probably one was her Secret Service man), came to the National the other night and came to see her afterwards, she said, "She asked me for an autograph. Isn't that a switch?"

"She is a delightful girl, and she is a beautiful girl. Her pictures don't flatter her at all."

Last night the Teddy Kennedys were in the audience—Joan having just come down from Hyannis, and Monday a week ago the Bobby Kennedys were there with the Averell Harrimans. The next day Bobby, whom she had met at functions but didn't know well, called her and invited her to a party.

"He was building it up and building it up," said Ethel who was getting pepped up about it until she asked him "When is it?" "Tonight," said the senator.

So she couldn't go, because on that Tuesday night she received at a National Press Club party the club's award for outstanding cooperation with the press, TV and radio. Only three other women have received it—Eleanor Roosevelt, Mme. Chiang, Kai-shek and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.

What makes her so young, vibrant and peppy? Does she take setting up exercises every day?

"No, I never do any exercises. The only thing I do is walk. When I am in New York, wherever I have to go, I walk. Sometimes I walk from 52nd Street to 77th."

Does she diet? "I just don't eat a lot of sweets," said Ethel.

What about her voice? Does she have to take care of that?

"I never do anything about it," said this singer who never had a voice lesson in her life. "I have been told by people taking singing lessons that I must be doing something right because it doesn't get tired." It wasn't even tired after doing seven shows in four days the first week here, and she is on the stage most of the time.

"And I don't know which is worse—to be on continually or have to go off and make a fast change. I don't know which is the most tiring."

After two shows Saturday she had the Cackle Club up to her suite at the Jefferson and stayed up until 4 a.m. The Cackle Club consists of seven persons connected with the show who are all stopping at the Jefferson and who like to sit up and cackle by the hour. Miss Merman is the honorary president.

"We are like high school kids," she said, describing the three games they played that night. "We played that chain letter game you see on NBC, and one called Chu-Chu, and another I don't know the name of. In that one we team up with two on each team and a team picks two famous people of the same name—like Buck Rogers and Richard Rodgers—one person becomes one, and the other becomes the other and they talk to each other as those people, and the rest in the room have to decide who they are. You try to give evasive clues in the beginning."

Members of the Cackle Club are her standby, Eileen Rogers; Jerry Orbach, who plays the barker in the show, and his wife; Ron Carroll who plays the hotel keeper, and his wife; and John Anderson, the conductor.

What does she do during the day? "I get up when I wake up. That's why I don't make luncheon dates. I usually sleep eight hours. Twice a week I come here (Madison Hotel beauty shop). Yesterday I went to Garfinkel's and bought it out—two beautiful evening outfits, two coats, one wool winter dress and a wool knit suit." She also has a weakness for buying jewelry.

What does she think about marrying again?

"The way I feel now, I don't. I play the field, and I enjoy it immensely.

"I don't usually associate with anyone in the business. Once I close that dressing

room door, I forget. Most people in (show) business are always on—always talking shop. I can't stand it."

Her son Bob, though—he is the son of her late husband, Bob Leavitt, but he legally took the name of Bob Six Jr. when she married Bob Six ("But Bob never adopted him")—is already involved in the theater. He had two years at Carnegie Tech where he majored in directing and is now production assistant at the William Shakespeare Festival in Stratford, Conn.

"Some day you are going to hear a lot about him."

Her daughter, Ethel Geary, 24, who has two children and lives in Sherman Oaks, Calif., "could have gone places as an actress because she did a lot of wonderful things at college."

By that time her nails were beautifully manicured and her hair was being combed out when another customer came in to hear my chihuahua, Pogo, sing again. He obliged, and Ethel joined in. It was the first duet of her life with a chihuahua.

As she walked out, still bubbling with vitality, she said she would play Philadelphia next week, open in New York on Sept. 20; be on Ed Sullivan's show on Sept. 25 and again on Jan. 8; and on Jan 25 she will be on Danny Kaye's show.

Peace Corps Next Step for Retiree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 12, 1966

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last week Congress passed and sent to the President for signing the Peace Corps authorization bill of 1966. It gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent acceptance for service in the Peace Corps of a 70-year-old retired nurse, Mrs. Mabel Yewell. Just last June Mrs. Yewell was honored at a retirement ceremony after 23 years of service at the Edgewood Arsenal. The Havre de Grace Record summarized Mrs. Yewell's transition from retiree to Peace Corps trainee in an article which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD:

PEACE CORPS NEXT STEP FOR RETIREE

After 23 years as a civilian nurse at Edgewood Arsenal, 70-year-old Mabel Yewell has decided to join the Peace Corps. Asked her reason for wanting to serve in the Corps, she replied: "I don't think I'm ready for a rocking chair."

Mrs. Yewell applied for a position with the Corps in January. She recently passed all the tests and physical examination and was accepted for two years of service, tentatively in India.

Mrs. Yewell, currently of Bel Air, has spent most of her life in Harford county. She has two children: Richard W. Yewell, Jr. and Mrs. Charles Shaffer, both of Bel Air, and four grandchildren.

After graduating from Church Home and Hospital in Baltimore, she joined the Army Nurse Corps, where she served for two years. After leaving the Corps she remained in public health work until 1943, when she joined Edgewood Arsenal. At the time of her retirement in June, she was chief nurse at the Arsenal dispensary.

At the end of the month she will leave for the University of North Carolina, where she

A4768

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 9, 1966

will go through four weeks of training before beginning her assignment. Questioned on her plans following her two years of service, she answered: "If I'm in one piece, I'll ask for an extension of my tour."

UN

Timetable for Vietnam

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's response to General de Gaulle's Vietnam proposals has received strong words of support from the Chicago Tribune.

The Tribune editorial reviews the President's offer of a timetable for withdrawal from Vietnam if anyone comes up with a schedule for halting the Communist aggression in that tormented land.

This was a sensible reply, the Tribune says. The newspaper suggests that General de Gaulle and his countrymen would not be free men today if the United States had failed to send military forces to Europe in World War II. And it contends the South Vietnamese would not retain the freedom they want if the De Gaulle proposals were adopted.

The complete editorial follows:

WHEN WE'LL WITHDRAW FROM VIETNAM

President Johnson made a sensible reply to President Charles de Gaulle's proposal that the United States set a "timetable" for withdrawal of its military forces from South Viet Nam. The proposal was made by the French president last week in a speech in Cambodia.

President Johnson replied to de Gaulle in a speech on Labor day in Lancaster, Ohio. He said:

"We cannot walk away from the simple fact that the peace and security of many nations are threatened if aggressors are permitted to succeed in a strategic area of the world, if vital treaties are broken, and if men and arms are moved illegally across international boundaries to conquer small nations."

Mr. Johnson went on to declare that United States troops will come home, and United States bases will be turned over to peace time purposes, as soon as aggression stops. He said:

"And I may add to all whom it may concern: If anyone will show me the time schedule when aggression and infiltration and 'might makes right' will be halted, then I, as President of this country, will lay on the table the schedule for the withdrawal of all our forces from Viet Nam."

This statement spells out firmly and simply what United States officials have been saying for a long time. They have asserted that the United States does not want permanent bases in South Viet Nam. They have promised to withdraw American troops as soon as North Viet Nam agrees to stop infiltrating South Viet Nam and to respect its independence.

President de Gaulle wants a unilateral declaration by the United States. On Friday he issued a joint communique with Prince Norodom Sihanouk, chief of state of Cambodia, asking for the cessation of all acts of war in Viet Nam, but the communique failed to mention infiltration by North Viet Nam.

De Gaulle's efforts to serve as a mediator in the conflict have been unhelpful. They will continue to be so until he recognizes that peace depends on cessation of the bloody campaign of aggression against South Viet Nam.

Of all the world's statesmen, de Gaulle ought to be most thoroughly aware of the consequences of aggression. He was a general in an army which was routed by aggressors in 1940. He and other Frenchmen would not be free men today if the United States had not sent military forces to Europe in World War II.

The people of South Vietnam would not retain the freedom they want if de Gaulle's peace proposals were adopted.

**Donald Douglas, Jr., President of Douglas
Aircraft Co., Speaks on Space Fallout**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 17, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a great majority of the people of this country view our space program as a limited program of placing a man on the moon—period. Every letter I receive denouncing our programs contain the phrase "a waste of millions of dollars to place a man on the moon." Very few people of this country know, appreciate, or realize the vast benefits derived from this program, both to our economy and to our well-being.

Mr. Donald W. Douglas, Jr., president of the Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., delivered a speech recently entitled "The Benign Fallout From Space Technology" which I would like to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of all who care to read it. I believe Mr. Douglas is to be complimented in his efforts to bring the story of the basic benefits which are being derived every day from our space program.

The speech follows:

**THE BENIGN FALLOUT FROM SPACE
TECHNOLOGY**

(Remarks by Donald W. Douglas, Jr., president, Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.,)

These beautiful groves of redwood trees, among the greatest of all nature's productions, may at first seem like incongruous place for a discussion of space technology. The injection of engineering and mechanical matters into such a setting sounds a jarring note.

Yet, on second thought, there is a certain harmony about it. For space technology is really nothing but the latest and most spectacular evidence of man's ability to unlock the secrets of nature and put them to work for him. However, to use the phrase "nothing but" certainly does not do the subject justice.

Actually this means that we are going through one of the most exciting and revolutionary phases of human existence. Dr. Lee DuBridge of Caltech recently emphasized this point when he said that man's ability to understand the physical world is really the one great development of the past 300 years. He described the acquisition of this understanding as the most important thing that

has happened in the 100,000 years that man has been present on the earthly scene.

That is why there can be no narrow definition of what we are talking about when we refer to "space technology". For space technology is simply the application in one direction of many technologies and scientific findings that the rapid expansion of knowledge has made available in recent years. A great array of scientific disciplines has played a part whenever we achieve a new success in space.

One of the greatest of these successes took place just last month. On June 1, at 11:17 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time a strange-looking, three-legged object, traveling at just eight miles an hour, set itself down on the surface of the moon.

This object, which we know as Surveyor I, had just completed a three and a half day, 234,000 mile journey through space. Forty minutes later it began sending to earth some of the most remarkable pictures in the history of photography. By daybreak 144 top quality pictures had been transmitted and as much had been accomplished as had been expected in the first three or four such missions. Man's knowledge of the moon was immeasurably increased in a few hours of time and proof that he knew how to get himself there was clearly demonstrated.

Now I would like for you to use your imagination for a minute. Just picture a line of 1966 automobiles stretching bumper to bumper from New York to Los Angeles. That's not supposed to be some kind of motorist's nightmare. Actually, it's not too far from the real thing if traffic gets much worse.

What this whopping and, I hope, imaginary traffic jam represents is horsepower equivalent to the thrust generated by the basic stage of the Saturn V. This is the vehicle, started on its way with 7,500,000 pounds of thrust, which will carry man to the moon. President Kennedy said we should do it in this decade and I believe that we will. The success of Surveyor I, both in transmitting information and in achieving a perfect soft landing, has considerably heightened the optimism of all concerned.

This effort to send man to the moon, for those who may not have followed it too closely, is known as the Apollo program. It is being carried on under direction of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. A number of major contractors, including Douglas, are involved. On other levels, thousands of subcontractors also are participating. More than 300,000 government and contractor employees are working on the program.

And, not just incidentally, this whole program is costing an estimated 22 billion dollars. I do not think it is an exaggeration to describe it as the greatest single effort in all history.

I have mentioned that the first stage of Saturn V will have 7,500,000 pounds of thrust. Just by way of comparison the first stage of Titan II used in the Gemini program has only 430,000 pounds of thrust.

Saturn V will be able to place 140 tons in earth orbit, 10,000 times the weight of Explorer I, the first American satellite which was orbited less than nine years ago. Most important, it will be able to send a 45-ton payload to the moon. All this is possible because, in addition to that initial stage, it will have a second stage with one million pounds of thrust and a third stage, which Douglas manufactures, with 200,000 pounds of thrust.

This entire vehicle, including the lunar module which will take men to the moon, stands 360 feet high. This is something less than the 550-foot Washington monument but it compares pretty well with some of our new 30 and 40-story buildings here on the West Coast.