

cards on juvenile arrests. Nonetheless, the table demonstrates the average experience for this group of offenders known to the Federal process through criminal fingerprint records during the year 1963. It also sheds some light on the chronic offender, local and Federal. The fact that three-fourths of the arrests of these offenders were for local charges and that most of the Federal charges are likewise local violations supports this contention.

The average age for these offenders (table A) in 1963 ranged from 43 years for the gambler to almost 29 years for those persons who during the course of their criminal career have been arrested for auto theft. Average age for first arrest for auto theft was 23 years, robbery 25 years, and gambling 36 years. All of these offenders show a much lower average age for first arrests for any offense, beginning with 19 in auto theft to 29 years for gambling and Federal liquor law violators.

Average criminal careers for these offenders, i.e., span of years from first to latest arrest, was highest for gambling, 14 years, followed by robbery and the assaultive crimes of murder and felonious assault, 13 years. Auto thieves, who are generally younger, had the shortest average span of 9 years but during that time accumulated, on the average, six arrests. The robber was high with nine arrests in 13 years, the burglar eight in 12 years, narcotics offenders eight arrests in 11 years, and the Federal liquor law violator four arrests in 11 years. When these charges are examined in relationship to the offenses which make up the Crime Index the robber contributed four such offenses out of

the total of nine charges, the burglar four of eight, the auto thief three, and assaultive-type offender three. Only one of the four arrests charged to the Federal liquor law violator fell in the Crime Index or serious crime category. These, of course, are only those crimes known to have been committed by these offenders through detection, arrest, and submission of fingerprint data.

Repeating the same type of crime had its highest level among narcotics violators, 48 percent having two or more narcotic arrests. The liquor law violator repeated in 39 percent of the individual records, bogus check offenders 38 percent, gamblers 37 percent, burglars 37 percent, auto thieves 33 percent, and the robber 25 percent.

The term "leniency" as explained above, in table A refers to known instances where an offender received probation or suspended sentence, parole, or conditional release. The frequency of leniency action is counted for any charge during the course of the criminal career of the offenders. Two-thirds of those offenders who had been arrested for robbery, burglary, auto theft, or bogus checks received leniency during their criminal career. The gambler had the lowest percentage of leniency, followed by the assaultive-type offender. Leniency action for the indicated charges of serious assault and murder, and sex offenses had the lowest percentage. Leniency was received on gambling charges only in 15 percent of the total; however, the lightness of the sentence usually connected with this offense would account for this. On the other hand leniency for auto theft charges was 46 percent and for narcotic offenses 36 percent.

Such a man is our President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, who has not reacted to the extremists over the situation in South Vietnam. His steadied and studied judgment is what we have had, and what we needed. Thank goodness for President Johnson, for he is standing the test in Vietnam.

An excellent editorial in the February 27, 1965, issue of the Jacksonville Journal points up the test of President Johnson's skill in this critical time, and I insert it below in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE BIG TEST

Rejection of feelers for negotiated settlement of the Vietnam fighting by President Johnson comes as no easy task, but as a decision of great importance to the entire Western World as well as the United States.

The administration will be criticized by many who feel that we are engaged in a fruitless, bloody endeavor that can only lead to an all-out war with the Communists or, at the very best, a costly stalemate.

The end, of course, is too far in the future and the events which will lead to that end are too involved now for anyone to foresee what it will be. Nevertheless, it appears that President Johnson is determined to continue our efforts to aid the South Vietnamese regardless of their seeming indifference, ineptitude, and general confusion.

The real test has descended upon Lyndon B. Johnson after 14 months as President—the bitter that he has to take along with the sweet of public acclaim and congressional obedience. Up to now he has had going for him comparative quiet in foreign affairs and only the domestic issues drew top priority.

These domestic issues called for skillful manipulation with Congress and a thorough understanding of pure political application to the problems before him. This was right down Mr. Johnson's alley. His long years in Washington, his acute sensitivity to the types of politicians he had to deal with and his knowledge of the machinery of Government gave him the upper hand in solving these problems.

Lyndon Johnson got a big break in his moratorium, his period of foreign inactivity, and he used it to command an overwhelming election victory for a presidential term of his own.

He must have known it couldn't last and it didn't.

The Vietnam problem has become compounded and so complex that no one can rightfully say which step is the bona fide step to make. If the United States pulls out of Vietnam she is not only subject to the ultimate communistic takeover of Asia, but she loses tremendous face doing it. If she stays, there is the big chance of World War III or many, many more casualties.

President Johnson is no longer sparring around with congressional friends and political foes. He is at last in the ring with the No. 1 challenger. In his first foreign affairs dilemma, he has drawn a stem-winder.

The way he handles the situation will not only affect the Vietnam crisis, it will affect his leadership both here and abroad.

Mr. Johnson is prudently, we believe, walking carefully. This country and the free world cannot afford a misstep.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Broadcasting Co. program "Meet the Press" on January 31, 1965, had a discussion which I believe is most useful in

TABLE A.—Profile of known repeaters by type of crime

	Murder and serious assault	Robbery	Burglary	Auto theft	Narcotics	Gambling	Bogus checks	Sex offenses	Federal liquor violators
Average age 1963.....	36	34	32	29	34	43	35	35	40
Average age first arrest for charge indicated.....	27	25	23	23	28	36	29	26	34
Average age at first arrest.....	22	20	20	19	22	29	23	21	29
Average criminal career (years).....	13	13	12	9	11	14	11	12	11
Average arrests during criminal career.....	8	9	8	6	8	6	7	8	4
Crime Index arrests.....	3	4	4	3	2	1	2	3	1
Frequency of arrest on indicated charge (percent):									
1.....	81	75	63	67	52	63	62	86	61
2.....	14	18	21	21	21	18	20	11	20
3 or more.....	5	7	16	12	27	19	18	3	19
Frequency of leniency action on any charge (percent):									
1.....	32	34	35	39	35	30	36	33	41
2.....	15	18	18	17	15	9	17	16	12
3 or more.....	9	14	13	11	10	6	13	12	6
Total.....	56	66	66	67	60	45	66	61	59
Leniency on indicated charge (percent).....	14	22	24	40	36	15	38	15	51
Average arrests after first leniency.....	5	6	5	4	5	4	5	6	2
Mobility:									
Arrests in 1 State (percent).....	39	33	31	28	53	60	32	37	69
2 States.....	31	28	30	31	27	24	25	28	22
3 States.....	14	16	17	17	10	8	16	14	6
4 States or more.....	16	23	22	24	10	8	27	21	3

After the first leniency action, these known offenders were arrested on new charges during the course of their criminal career ranging from a high of six for the robber and sex offender to two new charges for the Federal liquor law violator. The mobility of these criminal types is apparent from the number of States in which arrests were recorded during their criminal history. The robber, auto thief, burglar, and bogus check offender show high mobility. The gambler and the Federal liquor law violator on the other hand are mostly local types; that is, restrict their activity to one State.

This new statistical program on the careers in crime is in the development stage and it is anticipated that more definitive information will be made available in future issues of this publication, as well as other periodicals.

PRAISE FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, anyone can shoot from the hip. Especially a politician. Most of us are prone to react quickly, and sometimes violently, in defense of what we believe is a good cause. It is a lot easier to shoot now and ask questions later, just so we can be recorded on the right side.

The man who will take his time and make a decision based on all the facts available, without shooting from the hip, is the man to be praised and congratulated.

the courts in meting out punishment to violators. The time has come to meet this problem head on, and to take from the courts the power to turn loose on society the second and third offenders to continue preying on our citizens. My bills leave the courts no discretion in sentencing the guilty, and I think this legislation will go a long way in solving a growing problem.

How many times have we read of the ex-convict with a long string of arrests and convictions for armed robbery finally killing an innocent businessman in the course of another crime? How many times have we read of a criminal free on bond while awaiting trial being caught in the act of committing a similar offense?

How many times, Mr. Speaker, have we sat idly by and watched the courts repeatedly turn loose these vultures to continue preying on society, while the hue and cry mounts against those of us who happen to like to hunt, and who happen to like to own guns, and who abide by all of the laws of our society?

Passage of this legislation will stop the hysterical cries to unduly penalize the law-abiding citizens through imposition of rigid and unworkable restrictions on

sale, registration, or taxation of firearms, when the heart of the problem is to find a way to protect these same good citizens from the criminal in our midst.

I have no quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with those who wish to place needed and workable restrictions on the easy availability of firearms to the mentally incompetent, the criminal, or the unsupervised teenager. I have no quarrel with those who wish to prohibit our Nation becoming the world's dumping ground for surplus arms that are generally worthless and more often than not, extremely dangerous for the purchaser to use.

But I shall vigorously oppose any effort to impose sweeping restrictions upon the law-abiding citizen, while this Congress and the respective States blandly ignore the cause of our Nation's most serious problem. I urge my colleagues to join with me in this effort, and call their attention to the following information.

The District of Columbia Police Department furnished the statistics on the type of weapons used in major crime here, and the limited information on the nature of the criminal is from the most recent issue of the FBI's uniform crime report:

ter leniency, commitments to Federal institutions, some District of Columbia offenders, and a number of serious State and local violators being sought by the FBI under the Fugitive Felon Act. Excluded from this process were military criminal fingerprint submissions and chronic arrests for immigration violations.

Some preliminary analyses of this new information of these offenders are set forth herein. Of the 56,126 individual offenders who were actively handled in 1963, 75 percent had two or more arrests and 25 percent a single charge. Only 7 percent were female. By race, 73 percent were white, 25 percent Negro and 2 percent other races. A distribution by age in 1963 and age at first known arrest for these 56,126 offenders is shown below:

Percent distribution by age

Age	1963	At 1st arrest
Under 20.....	7.7	38.4
20 to 24.....	20.9	27.7
25 to 29.....	17.8	13.3
30 to 39.....	27.5	12.9
40 to 49.....	16.3	5.2
50 to 59.....	7.2	1.9
60 and over.....	2.6	.6

In reviewing the above, keep in mind that both policy and practice not to fingerprint juvenile offenders influences the above distribution. Of the more than 266,000 arrests accumulated by these offenders during the course of their criminal careers, 74 percent were local or State violations and 26 percent Federal violations.

The vast majority of these offenders, 75 percent with two or more charges, had an average criminal career—span of years from first to latest arrest—of 10 years. During this period these offenders were arrested an average of 4.5 times. According to these criminal histories, 52 percent had received leniency in the form of probation, suspended sentence, parole or conditional release. This, of course, is the criminal experience of the repeater who failed the confidence entrusted in the form of certain treatment. For the purposes of this study, probation, suspended sentence, parole and conditional release are referred to as "leniency." It goes without saying that probation and parole are special forms of treatment of criminals, but since they represent a lesser punitive action than incarceration, the term "leniency" is used here to point up this characteristic. Of those granted leniency, 68 percent received it once, 20 percent twice, and 12 percent three or more times. As a group these offenders who received leniency averaged three new arrests after the first leniency action. Their career criminal record averaged 12 years and 6 arrests. From the standpoint of mobility, 54 percent of these offenders confined their activity to one State, 25 percent were arrested in two States, 10 percent in three States, and 11 percent in four or more States. The mobility problem from jurisdiction to jurisdiction within a State, and particularly within a metropolitan area, is undoubtedly far greater.

The tabulation on page 32 captioned "Profile of Known Repeaters by Type of Crime" is an initial attempt to reveal some profile characteristics of criminal types. The sole test for selection and inclusion is one of the criminal groups was an arrest for such a crime during the course of a person's criminal career. It was not limited to arrests for specific crimes in 1963. Thus, there is some duplication of offenders in certain categories in that the same person may have been arrested for burglary and robbery and so would appear in both categories. Generally, criminals do not confine their activity to a single type of criminal act. Average age at first charge and age at arrest for the first indicated charge has a tendency to be higher than in reality due to the lack of fingerprint

Weapons used in homicides and aggravated assaults and robbery

MURDER

Fiscal year	Total	Revolvers or pistols		Rifles		Shotguns		Knives	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1952.....	59	19	32.2	2	3.4			9	15.2
1953.....	68	15	22.0			2	2.9	20	29.4
1954.....	73	17	23.3			2	2.7	24	32.9
1955.....	44	11	25.0					12	27.3
1956.....	55	18	32.7			3	5.5	15	27.3
1957.....	63	18	28.6	1	1.6	4	6.3	15	23.8
1958.....	77	20	26.0	3	3.9	1	1.3	27	35.1
1959.....	69	20	29.0	1	1.4	2	2.9	21	30.4
1960.....	72	18	25.0	2	2.8	5	6.9	21	29.2
1961.....	82	28	34.1	1	1.2	2	2.4	19	23.2
1962.....	85	24	28.2	2	2.4	4	4.7	16	18.8
1963.....	83	21	25.3	2	2.4	4	4.7	21	25.3
1964.....	104	37	35.6	3	2.9	1	1.0	29	27.9

AGGRAVATED ASSAULT

Fiscal year	Total	Revolvers or pistols	Rifles	Shotguns	Knives
1952.....	4,547	265	3	14	1,552
1953.....	4,598	281	6	17	1,542
1954.....	4,431	216	16	35	1,485
1955.....	4,580	228	16	30	1,420
1956.....	2,824	229	9	31	1,435
1957.....	2,545	223	21	27	1,312
1958.....	2,791	256	23	23	1,204
1959.....	2,505	277	17	27	1,086
1960.....	3,067	295	26	41	1,213
1961.....	2,900	302	21	34	1,278
1962.....	2,956	393	23	39	1,218
1963.....	2,998	415	21	31	1,161
1964.....	2,754	467	20	27	1,082

NOTE.—During fiscal year 1964 pistols were used in 482, or 18.3 percent, of the 2,631 robberies; shotguns, 17; and rifles, 8.

In 1963 the FBI initiated a statistical program utilizing these criminal identification records for the purpose of providing an analysis of criminal and prosecutive history of known offenders. Law enforcement agencies—local, State and Federal—submit to the Identification Division of the FBI criminal fingerprint cards on persons arrested. Submissions are not made uniformly by all law enforcement agencies on all charges. Generally, the practice is to submit a criminal fingerprint card on all serious offenses, felonies and certain misdemeanors. On the Federal level, nearly all arrested persons are fingerprinted by the Federal investigative agencies, U.S. marshals and the Bureau of Prisons.

Through this positive means of identification the criminal history of an offender be-

comes known. It is limited to the degree, of course, that the offender is detected, arrested and fingerprint cards submitted. At the present time the criminal history and other characteristics of offenders who are being handled in the Federal criminal administration of justice are being stored in automatic data processing equipment. Each of the fingerprint files of these known offenders in the Identification Division is being "flushed," which establishes a method of following up on these offenders as to future criminal involvement which can be added over time.

During the year 1963, some 56,126 individual records were processed in the above manner. They are for the most part persons arrested on a Federal charge in 1963, parolees, probationers or persons who violated the lat-

analyzing the complex situation in Vietnam. The guest on that Sunday was Prof. Bernard Fall. The panel consisted of Robert Goralski, NBC News; Marguerite Higgins, Newsday; Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News; and Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent panel member and producer. The moderator was Ned Brooks.

Dr. Fall is a well-known expert on southeast Asian affairs and has written two very well received books on the subject: "Street Without Joy," and "Two Vietnams." Dr. Fall, a professor of international relations at Howard University, brings insight and knowledge to the problem of Vietnam. I call the attention of my colleagues to the following transcript of "Meet the Press":

[From "Meet the Press," Jan. 31, 1965]

MEET THE PRESS

Mr. BROOKS. This is Ned Brooks, inviting you to "Meet the Press." Our guest today on "Meet the Press" is recognized as an outstanding authority on Vietnam and southeast Asia. Dr. Bernard Fall. He has traveled widely in North and South Vietnam, and he has interviewed many Communist officials including North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh. Dr. Fall served in the French underground and the French Army. He is the author of several books on Vietnam. Also he is professor of international relations at Howard University in Washington, D.C. We will have the first question now from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

Mr. SPIVAK. Dr. Fall, in the past you have spoken and written of American illusions about Vietnam. What do you consider our major illusions are?

Dr. FALL. I will say that the major illusion in the past was that an insurgency is mainly a military operation, or let us say counterinsurgency is merely a military counteroperation. As it turns out, insurgency is mainly an operation designed to take over a country's control, not simply defeat its military forces.

The second illusion has been that the defeats in Vietnam, as they have occurred over the past 5 years, can be ascribed to any particular group, whether it is the Buddhists or the students or let's say incapable Vietnamese military leaders. That too is an illusion. The faults, the mistakes go far deeper than that.

Mr. SPIVAK. You have also said that policymakers during the past 8 to 10 years have made "monstrous errors in judgment in Vietnam." What were some of the monstrous errors—were they just illusions or were they specific errors?

Dr. FALL. Some were simply and purely the failure to recognize what the problem really and truly was. For example, you can go back to the French period. I recall reading official statements that the French were winning the war at a particular point, and the French were far from winning it. In 1954 there was the illusion that the French Navarre plan would succeed. By the time Navarre became commander in chief, the French Army was on the ropes. Later on, one of the greater illusions, I recall, was to depict Diem as a Churchill in southeast Asia, as a man deeply interested in democracy. Diem was a dictator, and Diem failed to recognize precisely that one of his problems was lack of contact and progressive loss of contact with his own people. And lastly we came down to the military illusions, again, of the 1961-62 period. You will recall, for example, the statement of October 2, 1963, that the American troops could be withdrawn by 1965 and that in fact 1,000 troops could be sent home. Well, far from sending home 1,000 troops, in the meantime the Military

Establishment, the American commitment in Vietnam had to be increased practically by 50 percent. And far from the situation improving—and it hadn't improved even then when the statement was made; in fact it was far worse than it had ever been before—the situation of course has greatly deteriorated.

Mr. SPIVAK. Former Vice President Nixon the other day said if our strategy in South Vietnam is not changed, we will be thrown out in a matter of months, certainly within the year. Is that an illusion, or is that an error of judgment?

Dr. FALL. There is a very interesting parallel between Mr. Nixon's statement last week and Mr. Nixon's statement in February 1954, when he also made a statement saying that the only way to win Vietnam is to commit the United States fully in the war, at that time on the side of the French. I don't think that the United States has to be thrown out within 3 or 4 months or for that matter within a year. I would say the United States has the wherewithal to stay in Vietnam if she so desires. The whole point is, of course, what is the price tag?

Mr. SPIVAK. He also said "Our security requires the United States to end the war in Vietnam by winning it." Do you agree with that?

Dr. FALL. I don't know from what basis of information Mr. Nixon speaks. He is now a private person just as I am a private person. Obviously no country likes to lose a war. Whether the American security is involved in Vietnam is a matter of discussion. Quite a few people inside Government disagree on whether Vietnam is essential to the United States directly in the same sense, let's say, as Hawaii is essential, I understand. As you know, one, there are some people who speak of "back to Waikiki" if Vietnam is lost, and others say Vietnam is more or less expendable.

Mr. SPIVAK. What is your judgment? Do you think our interests are involved in this?

Dr. FALL. I would say American interests are involved. Whether vital or not, I don't think so.

Mr. SPIVAK. You don't evidently hold to the domino theory, that is if we lose South Vietnam we may finally have to fight in the Philippines or possibly Hawaii?

Dr. FALL. As I said before, I don't think we have to lose South Vietnam any more than we have to lose Europe because we lost Czechoslovakia. Whether the domino—the domino theory could have been invoked for that matter when we lost China. I would say that the United States has the wherewithal in southeast Asia to contain communism on a basis that's acceptable to the West and without the loss of effective strength.

Mr. LISAGOR. Dr. Fall, you have said just now that you think the United States has the wherewithal to stay in Vietnam. You have said in other places that you think the credibility of the American counterinsurgency is involved in Vietnam. If we have the wherewithal and if the credibility of our counterinsurgency is involved, why should we not stay in Vietnam?

Dr. FALL. Because a counterinsurgency operation can become terribly expensive. This has happened before, for example. The British had the wherewithal to stay in Cyprus, and they fought for 5 years with 40,000 troops against 300 Greeks, then decided to call it quits.

The French were staying in Algeria and fought on for 8 years and were not losing militarily but decided that politically it was better to pull out.

Mr. LISAGOR. But the British stayed on the northwest frontier in India for scores of years and didn't withdraw. Isn't our interest involved so deeply in South Vietnam today insofar as it contains Chinese Communist expansion, that we might well consider staying there, and also isn't it true that the war isn't terribly expensive, relatively speaking?

Dr. FALL. Exactly, relatively speaking. Surely. Everybody points to the 300 casualties dead or 1,500 wounded, and they say "This is very easy. This is less than what we lose in car accidents in American military camps in the States."

The hard fact is, it commits right now about one-fourth of the total cadre, officer cadre, lieutenants, majors, for example, of the U.S. ground forces, in Vietnam. This is from a speech by Lt. Gen. Creighton Abrams, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. It is expensive. It commits an American amount of aid expenditure which is almost one-third of the total aid budget, more or less. So it is an expensive war.

This kind of small war tends to grow on you literally, and this is one of them. So the judgment has to be made by the U.S. Government, and I am sure it will be made by the President, whether holding on, as we say is not in fact more expensive than arriving at the diplomatic solution—at a solution which will not mean "selling out" the Western interests in Vietnam.

Miss HIGGINS. Dr. Fall, you mentioned Algeria and France and her decision to get out before she was militarily beaten. Are you saying that America in Vietnam is a colonial power as France was in Algeria?

Dr. FALL. Absolutely not.

Miss HIGGINS. There is a difference that can be made then to the Vietcong, and our position is not as politically assailable as that of France?

Dr. FALL. The trouble is, whether you and I know that the United States—and we do know it—that the United States is no colonial power in southeast Asia or for that matter anywhere else, is totally irrelevant to the Communist propaganda cadre, the "can-bo" on the ground, who points at the American officer, at the American noncom, who is there and says, "You see, your troops are again, your government troops are again commanded by those Americans, just like they were when the French officers were there."

This is, of course, one of the troubles, and this is recognized.

Miss HIGGINS. What would the Vietcong and the Communist propaganda say if America broke its pledged word in Vietnam, and do you think that any other ally to whom we pledged defense and help would trust us if we broke our pledges in Vietnam?

Dr. FALL. The question is not breaking an American pledge. The question is arriving at the situation which will save Vietnam. For example, if the United States were to arrive at such a saving of Vietnam by using as a diplomatic argument the American Forces, such as the 7th Fleet, the Pacific Air Force, et cetera, this is not breaking a pledge to Vietnam. The President has said that the United States is in Vietnam at the request of the Vietnamese people. As you well know, one of the problems may well arise where a proper neutralist government comes to power in Vietnam, like Kong-Le in Laos, who from one day as pro-American turned into pronneutralist, and asks the United States to get out. Then what?

Miss HIGGINS. Then you are saying that you don't believe we can break our word, and if we find a solution, it has to be within a framework of having kept our pledges, correct?

Dr. FALL. I think the United States is keeping its pledge right now.

Miss HIGGINS. The Russians have announced a very important official visit to Hanoi. Is that news that should cheer us or depress us?

Dr. FALL. I wish there were a simple answer to that. Personally I would say that the very importance of the Russian mission—is not that Kosygin, the Prime Minister goes, but some of the specialists in certain fields, such as rocket forces for example, such as air

transport, such as Russian foreign aid. It seems to me that the Russians have reentered southeast Asia. As you know after the Laos crisis there was a certain feeling in the West that the Russians had decided to call it quits, at least on the southeast Asia mainland and perhaps would concentrate on India and Indonesia, just like the United States might decide to concentrate for her aid on some key countries. Apparently as of yesterday, we are facing a reentry of the Russians into the field. Two versions are likely. Either the Russians have decided that the Chinese might be close to winning and can't afford to let China go away with that victory—or vice versa, the Russians have decided that the commitment may become far bigger and rather than be dragged into a war on China's side, step in to facilitate perhaps a meeting between the Communist side and the U.S. side.

Miss HIGGINS. You are one of the few Westerners who have visited North Vietnam. As you know, many of the Vietcong deserters who come over to our side say they come over because even the peasantry in turmoil-ridden South Vietnam is better off than the peasantry in North Vietnam. What is your observation, what is the state of the economy? Is it as bad as they paint it?

Dr. FALL. As you know, I have been to North Vietnam even before the Communists took over, so I have a basis for comparison in the case. The country obviously is dreary. To give you an example there are probably 50 automobiles in a city of 600,000 people, like Hanoi. But one thing, the North Vietnamese sell one thing that we can't beat, and that is peace. Obviously, yes, they are behind the rebellion in South Vietnam. On the other hand in North Vietnam a peasant doesn't get napalm. He works hard but he stays alive.

Point 2, the North Vietnamese have built up a respectable industrial establishment. Like most Communist countries they try hard, and at least they have the wherewithal to do it well.

Point 3, the Communists have a large army. They have a large army and above all, right now, they think they are winning.

Miss HIGGINS. But what about whether a peasant in Vietnam, as the deserters to our side say, is often hungry, is that possibly true?

Dr. FALL. That is—they are likely to have short rations, but the fact the man is a deserter shows he is not one of the hard core.

Mr. GORALSKI. Dr. Fall, you said earlier that we can win in Vietnam. How do we do it? If you were in a position of responsibility in this country, if you were determining foreign policy, what would you do in Vietnam to win that war?

Dr. FALL. This is obviously—we always arrive at the professor who thinks he has all the solutions. In all seriousness, I think that the United States has in southeast Asia the combination of American—the mix of American forces available makes an American posture, defense posture in there credible. The United States is doing badly—let's not kid ourselves—on the ground inside South Vietnam. All the mythology is by now just about gone. We know it. But the Communists in North Vietnam still risk two things, (a) an American massive bombardment which would knock out those industries—and this is the only thing that they really did do in the last 10 years—and (b) the immediate Chinese Communist counter-invasion of North Vietnam which would occur in all likelihood. In other words, North Vietnam would be reduced to the state of North Korea. North Vietnam is not—I repeat, definitely not—and probably the Kossygin visit shows this—a totally helpless Chinese satellite. The North Vietnamese did not fight the French for 30 years and the Americans now for 10 just for the joy of selling out to Peiping.

Mr. GORALSKI. You don't believe that escalating the war would be helpful at all at this stage?

Dr. FALL. This already has been proved. The U.S. massive bombardment operation in North Korea called Operation Strangle was an utter failure against Communist communication lines. The French Operation Vulture in 1954, which was designed to knock out Communist communications against Dienbienphu was a failure. There is no such thing as bombing supply lines in the jungle.

Mr. SPIVAK. Dr. Fall, I am not quite clear as to what you are getting at in the advice you are giving here. You say that the United States can wipe out industry in North Vietnam, I believe you said, in 24 hours. You say that the North Vietnamese are scared to death of having the Chinese Communists come in. What objection then is there for us to use the force we have to hit them as hard as we can, which is what Nixon and others want to do?

Dr. FALL. Because it is militarily meaningless. This is exactly it. All we would do is knock out factories which the Communists did not have in 1954 when they defeated the French, and all we would get in return is probably 14 Communist divisions down our necks in South Vietnam.

In other words, the fear of the bombardment, the fear of Chinese pressure, and, of course, vice versa, of American pressure, is useful in diplomatic confrontation to even out the stakes.

Militarily it is nonsense. Just look at the bridge of Ban-Ban—incidentally, at which I was shot at in 1953—which the Communists rebuilt or bypassed inside 3 days. This is a typical example of what you can do with massive airpower in a counterinsurgency operation.

Mr. SPIVAK. Do you say that neither side can win, or that we can go on and spend a lot of money there and that we can't win; the best we can do is to hold our own there?

Dr. FALL. That is exactly it. Neither side can win. This is going to be one of those guerrilla standoffs, of which we have several on record. I come back once more to Algeria—again, I repeat, it is not the colonial comparison; it is a tactical comparison. The Algerians knew—and I was, in 1963, in Algeria—that they couldn't lick the French militarily. There wasn't going to be a Dien Bien Phu. And vice versa, the French also knew they weren't going to be able to wipe out the Algerians. It was out of that standoff that a negotiation came.

Mr. SPIVAK. But Dr. Fall, we know in this country, for example, we can't wipe out crime, and yet we have to have police departments to fight it, and we have to go right on fighting it all the time. This is about the situation that we are in there. We feel we have to continue fighting whether or not we can win, even if it is just to keep things stable. Don't you go along with that theory?

Dr. FALL. I go along with the theory on crime, not on counter-insurgency, for the good reason that, yes, the United States fights crime, but not at the price of martial law in the cities. Martial law is rather considered an extreme in anticrime fighting. In other words, yes, if South Vietnam were, by sheer miracle—and this would take a long time—if South Vietnam tomorrow morning were at a sort of guerrilla standoff with the Communists, then after peace, after some sort of settlement had been arrived at, counterinsurgency in the sound sense of civic action of local improvements will come in its own.

Mr. SPIVAK. Dr. Fall, as a Frenchman aren't you thinking a little too much of French defeats and not of American power?

Dr. FALL. You may recall that I used the British standoff in Cyprus. I could add the British standoff also in Palestine. Counterinsurgency operations have been lost—the Germans in Russia lost a counterinsurgency operation. There were 49 separate insurgency wars since 1900, and the winning side has, in many cases, been the guerrilla, for various reasons.

Mr. LISAGOR. Dr. Fall, to clarify what you

have said, are you now saying that there can be no winner and there can be no loser in Vietnam, that the most we can do is to have a standoff there or outlast the Communists? Is that what you are saying?

Dr. FALL. That is substantially correct, yes.

Mr. LISAGOR. Well, one of the penalties of an expert, it seems to me, is that he is always having his views quoted back at him. You have said that you wouldn't bet that the United States can win in South Vietnam or save it from a Communist takeover. You have said that the cutting off of weapons supply from the north will do very little good, and you also say that if we strike north, the Communists are likely—the Chinese Communists are likely to enter the fray. Under these conditions what kind of a deal do you see in the making, except the deal of total surrender, or giving up, under conditions that the Communists may impose?

Dr. FALL. Well, the whole point is—I will come back to what I just said before, and what you quoted is right there in line with this—that the American ability of striking at North Vietnam, in case of a resumption of any kind of insurgency after a settlement has been attained—just like in Korea, the American capability of retaliation is not the two American divisions on the 38th parallel, it is the overall American defensive posture in the Pacific. That is the same thing in Vietnam.

Mr. LISAGOR. But I think you said to Mr. Spivak that you thought a bombardment of North Vietnam would be militarily meaningless.

Dr. FALL. That is correct. In other words, as soon as the United States—let me make this quite clear—as soon as the United States bombs North Vietnam, there goes the baby with the bath. The North Vietnamese lose whatever was worth gaining in that fight. In other words, to win South Vietnam for the North Vietnamese unless they are totally irrational—and so far they have not been in 30 years—would simply mean losing the last chance of making this a net gain. To get South Vietnam at the price of every North Vietnamese city being totally flattened, even though this is militarily meaningless, makes it, of course, politically hopeless.

Mr. LISAGOR. What you are saying is that the threat should be posed but not the action, is that it? In other words, we should try to blackmail North Vietnam without following through if that becomes necessary?

Dr. FALL. We, (a) yes, we should blackmail North Vietnam, (b) I would feel, obviously, that if the threat has to be carried out, we must realize that its carrying out will not change substantially the military problem. Any more than in Korea—than it did in Korea. In other words, we must realize, as—I think it was the President, or was it the Secretary of State, who said it might then become a 10-year operation, still with the same result, perhaps.

Miss HIGGINS. But is there any such thing in Asia as a short guerrilla war?

Dr. FALL. Some of the guerrilla wars like in Malaya, for example, lasted 13 years at the ratio of 350,000 troops, on the British side, 85,000 of whom were British, against 8,000 guerrillas. In other words, the British were fighting at 35 to 1, and it took them 13 years. In Vietnam right now, the Western forces, the United States advisers, plus Vietnamese, fight at four and a half to five to one. It is generally accepted that to break even—not to win, to break even—in a revolutionary warfare operation, it takes a 10 to 15 to 1 superiority. In other words, right now, brutally spoken, we don't have the wherewithal on the ground to break even. So the holding operation under those circumstances is going to be a long, bleeding operation.

Miss HIGGINS. Do the Vietcong, to make it perfectly clear, have the capacity to force the military decision in Vietnam?

Dr. FALL. Not of the Dienbienphu type. no. The Vietcong as we just said before, the Vietcong, like the Algerian FLN, for that matter, or Mr. Grivas, Colonel Grivas on Cyprus, could hold on for 10 or 15 years.

Miss HIGGINS. Then the only way that they could "win" would be for us to willingly give up for political reasons?

Dr. FALL. No, there is a second alternative which I mentioned before, and I think you mentioned it in your interesting column today, the fact is that some of the South Vietnamese leaders may pull a Kong-Le on us. They may literally, just from one government to the next, finally come up and say, "Well, thank you very much, United States, this is where the kissing stops," and the United States is then caught. So these two alternatives exist: Defeat, or—in other words, long-range bleeding—or the inside overthrow.

Mr. BROOKS. We have about 2 minutes.

Mr. GORALSKI. Dr. Fall, there are a lot of people who believe that South Vietnam is not a military problem, it is a political problem, stability within South Vietnam. Do you think that political stability is possible, given the situation today?

Dr. FALL. No.

Mr. GORALSKI. How is it going to be achieved? Who is going to come out on top?

Dr. FALL. There we come back to the old story of instant democracy. There is no such thing in the area. On the other hand there is such a thing as basic democracy. We keep forgetting that it was Mr. Diem who after 30 years—40 years of elected village chiefs, abolished elected village chiefs in June 1956. This is a perfect example of what I mean. In other words, in Vietnam we have to come back, finally, and acknowledge the fact that we have to start from scratch, if we want to stay in at all. You are right, it is a civilian operation.

Mr. GORALSKI. Some people say, good or bad, Ngo Dinh Diem, whether he was an autocratic dictator or a George Washington of Asia, that we probably would be in a better position today had he not been overthrown in November 1963, and the whole family was back in power. What do you say to that?

Dr. FALL. By the time Mr. Diem was murdered we had lost about the control of two-thirds of the population of Vietnam. The only thing that Mr. Diem did for us—he plastered over. The facade was kept up, that is right. In Saigon we didn't have any uprisings. The fact is we had lost over 8,000 village chiefs in Vietnam by that time. The fact is that of the 8,000 strategic hamlets only 1,500 were viable by the time he died. This, neither the Buddhists in Saigon nor the CIA did it. It is what Diem did to himself.

Mr. SPIVAK. Dr. Fall, from your knowledge of the present situation in South Vietnam, do you think it is possible to get a stable government there now?

Dr. FALL. No sir.

Mr. SPIVAK. Not at all, not even a military dictatorship?

Dr. FALL. Military dictatorship is usually a very poor substitute for stability. It just establishes, perhaps, for one time, the facade of stability. Remember there are neutralist military dictatorships.

Mr. SPIVAK. Dr. Fall, I hate to quote you to yourself, but in a recent current history article you wrote, "It should be obvious by now that, in the present state of affairs in South Vietnam, everything is Communist infiltrated." Does that apply to the government, too?

Dr. FALL. Correct.

Mr. BROOKS. I am afraid we are going to have to call that the question and the answer because we have run out of time. Thank you very much for being with us, Dr. Fall.

MEDICARE AND ELDERCARE, CONFUSED DOMESTIC ISSUE

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

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, the most confused domestic issue in national politics today is the subject of medicare and eldercare. Neither of these labels disclose the actual contents of the packages being proposed by the administration and by the American Medical Association.

It is easy to hear opinions for or against each proposal but it is difficult to find a concise, factual analysis and comparison of the bill popularly known as medicare—H.R. 1—and the plan more

recently introduced known as eldercare—H.R. 3827 and H.R. 3728.

At my request, and for the benefit of myself and my constituents, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared an objective analysis and comparison of these two plans.

I realize that what may emerge from the Ways and Means Committee of the House may be somewhat different from either of these bills. I am convinced, however, that this analysis and comparison widely disseminated can eliminate such confusion in the minds of many people.

Furthermore, I believe consideration of this information will assist those in and out of Congress in evaluating the specific legislation to be recommended by the Ways and Means Committee:

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED LAW WITH THE AMENDMENTS TO IT PROPOSED BY THE ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965

H.R. 3727 (CONGRESSMAN HERLONG); H.R. 3728 (CONGRESSMAN CURTIS) AND OTHERS

EXISTING LAW

A. Brief summary

Permits States to include in their plans under title I a program of medical assistance for the aged (MAA); that is, to provide medical vendor payments (payments directly to the suppliers of medical services) for aged persons who are not old-age assistance recipients, but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services. The State plan for medical assistance for the aged may specify medical services of broad scope and duration provided that both institutional (hospitals, etc.) and noninstitutional (outpatient clinics, etc.) services are included.

There is no dollar ceiling, the overall amount of Federal participation is governed by the extent of the State programs. The Federal share varies from 50 percent (for States with per capita income equal to or above the national average) up to 80 percent for lower per capita income States.

Adds a new section to title I which would authorize a State, at its option, to provide MAA in the form of premium payments for guaranteed renewable private health insurance. Such coverage would have to be made available to all aged residents in the State. As to MAA recipients, there would be State and Federal participation in the full cost of the payment. As to individuals above the MAA maximum income limit, there would be part payment by the individual, in such proportions (based on his income) as the State agency may determine, up to such higher level as the State agency may consider appropriate. Above this level all the premiums would be paid by the individual. Certification of income under oath shall be accepted as conclusive for eligibility purposes. Increases Federal participation in State MAA expenditures by 5 percent as to that portion in the form of health insurance coverage under the new section.

Modifies MAA income and resources test to one of income alone. Exempts from prohibition against enrollment fees and premium charges the assistance provided under the health insurance coverage above. Provides that a statement of income under oath shall be accepted by State agency as conclusive for eligibility purposes.

B. Eligibility for assistance

To be eligible an individual—

- (1) must have attained age 65;
- (2) must not be a recipient of old-age assistance;
- (3) must have income and resources, as determined by the State, insufficient to meet all of the cost of the medical services outlined below. The State plan must provide reasonable standards, consistent with the objectives of the program, for determining eligibility and the extent of assistance.

- (1) same as existing law;
- (2) same as existing law;

- (3) modified so that assistance would be provided in behalf of individuals whose income (rather than income and resources) is insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical services.

C. Scope of benefits

Same as existing law.

The State plan for medical assistance for the aged may specify medical services of any scope and duration, provided that both institutional and noninstitutional services are included. Federal participation is restricted to vendor medical payments: i.e., payments made by the States directly to the doctor, hospital, etc., providing medical services on behalf of the recipient.

The Federal Government shares in the expense of providing the following kinds of medical services:

1. Inpatient hospital services;

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED LAW WITH THE
AMENDMENTS TO IT PROPOSED BY THE ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965—ContinuedH.R. 3727 (CONGRESSMAN HEHLONG); H.R. 3728
(CONGRESSMAN CURTIS) AND OTHERS

EXISTING LAW

C. Scope of benefits—Continued

2. Skilled nursing home services;
3. Physicians' services;
4. Outpatient hospital (or clinic services);
5. Home health care services;
6. Private duty nursing services;
7. Physical therapy and related services;
8. Dental services;
9. Laboratory and x-ray services;
10. Prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices;
11. Diagnostic, screening, and preventive services; and
12. Any other medical care or remedial care recognized under State law.

The Federal Government does not share in the expense of providing medical services to inmates of public institutions (other than medical institutions), to patients in mental or tuberculosis institutions or to patients in medical institutions as a result of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis after 42 days of care.

D. Matching formula

Same as existing law except that as to amounts expended on MAA in the form of private health insurance coverage under the new section the Federal medical matching percentage will be increased by 5 percent. For such health insurance expenditures Federal matching will run from 52½ percent to 84 percent as noted below:

Federal medical percentages applicable for July 1, 1963, through June 30, 1965	
Percentage	Percentage
Alabama.....	82.20
Alaska.....	52.50
Arizona.....	61.69
Arkansas.....	84.00
California.....	52.50
Colorado.....	52.50
Connecticut.....	52.50
Delaware.....	52.50
District of Columbia.....	52.50
Florida.....	63.72
Georgia.....	52.50
Guam.....	52.50
Hawaii.....	70.80
Idaho.....	52.50
Illinois.....	54.66
Indiana.....	60.51
Iowa.....	59.46
Kansas.....	79.03
Kentucky.....	77.13
Louisiana.....	68.93
Maine.....	52.50
Maryland.....	52.50
Massachusetts.....	52.50
Michigan.....	59.24
Minnesota.....	84.00
Mississippi.....	52.97
Missouri.....	62.67
Montana.....	59.69

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED LAW WITH THE
AMENDMENTS TO IT PROPOSED BY THE ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965—ContinuedH.R. 3727 (CONGRESSMAN HEHLONG); H.R. 3728
(CONGRESSMAN CURTIS) AND OTHERS

EXISTING LAW

Federal medical percentages applicable for July 1, 1963, through June 30, 1965—Continued

Percentage	Percentage
Nebraska.....	55.10
Nevada.....	50.00
New Hampshire.....	56.38
New Jersey.....	50.00
New Mexico.....	66.55
New York.....	50.00
North Carolina.....	74.99
North Dakota.....	73.03
Ohio.....	50.00
Oklahoma.....	65.65
Oregon.....	50.00
Pennsylvania.....	50.00
Puerto Rico.....	50.00
Rhode Island.....	50.90
South Carolina.....	80.00
South Dakota.....	67.87
Tennessee.....	75.53
Texas.....	61.45
Utah.....	62.23
Vermont.....	64.75
Virgin Islands.....	50.00
Virginia.....	65.05
Washington.....	50.00
West Virginia.....	71.76
Wisconsin.....	52.50
Wyoming.....	50.00

(27 F.R. 9230)

Seventy-five percent Federal matching is authorized for certain rehabilitation services for aged recipients and for the training of welfare personnel.

The Federal Government pays 50 percent of administrative costs.

Pass along provision: No provision in existing law to insure that public assistance recipients receive higher payments because of legislation liberalizing the Federal matching formula.

E. State plan requirements

The following changes are made in MAA State plan requirements:

In order to be eligible for Federal participation, the State must provide medical assistance for the aged according to a plan submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and approved by him, which meets the requirements set out in the law. The State plan provisions are generally the same as those required for the other public assistance programs with the following exceptions:

A State plan—

1. Must not require a premium enrollment fee, or similar charge, as a condition of eligibility.
2. Must not impose property liens during the lifetime of the individual receiving benefits (except pursuant to court judgment on account of benefits incorrectly paid) and any recovery provisions under the plan must be limited to the estate of the individual after his death and the death of his surviving spouse.

1. Provides an exception with respect to assistance furnished in the form of health insurance coverage under the new section.

2. Same as existing law.

Appendix

Getting to Work and Back—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues to the second half of Consumer Reports' excellent opening article in the series called "Getting to Work and Back." The article follows:

GETTING TO WORK AND BACK—PART 2

To many freeway enthusiasts, objections based on personal or local considerations seem selfish and even perverse. Sacrifices, they urge, must be made to the common good. There is some merit in this view. Individual objections can be pressed beyond reason.

Opposition can be expected to grow even more effective during the remaining years of the Interstate System construction program, as more communities experience for themselves just how a freeway affects community life—and as all the easy routes are completed, leaving unfinished and perhaps unfinished the routes that dispossess the largest number of people, remove the largest amounts of taxable land from the rolls, despoil the best loved parks and views, or otherwise rouse the ire of the local citizenry.

If the high dollar cost and the high social cost of urban freeways were necessary to achieve a fast transportation system, the benefits might be balanced against the costs. But commuters are increasingly learning that for the trip to work downtown, the new freeways are not fast.

Consumers Union has examined unpublished data, for example, for a 12-mile-long stretch of Chicago's Congress Street (Eisenhower) Expressway, composed partly of 8 lanes posted at 55 miles per hour and partly of 6 lanes posted at 60 or 65 miles per hour. When traffic is flowing freely, a driver can cover the 12 miles with ease in 13 minutes. But during rush hour, the trip over the same 12 miles may take as long as 35 minutes.

This figure, impressive though it is, seriously understates the problem. For it does not include the excess time it takes to get into or out of a parking garage in rush-hour traffic, to weave through the congested local streets to a freeway entrance, to queue up at the entrance, and then to crawl up the ramp and push a way into the moving stream of traffic.

Wasted time can be evaluated in various ways. One approach values the commuter's time at some arbitrarily chosen amount, such as \$1.50 per hour. On this basis, 30 minutes wasted each way each day costs each commuter some \$325 per year. More complicated calculations have also been made. None of them takes into account what it means to wife, husband, and children to be cheated out of an hour together—and to have a father arrive home fretful, grumpy, exhausted, and late for dinner after battling traffic congestion on the new freeway.

OUR CONGESTED FUTURE

Freeway proponents point out that the urban freeway system is not complete as yet.

Thus laymen may be tempted to dismiss current freeway congestion as mere growing pains—a temporary affliction that will be cured when the rest of the Interstate System freeways are opened to traffic.

Transportation engineers know better. The ultimate inadequacy of the center-city portions of the Interstate System was revealed in 1961, in a study commissioned by the Automobile Manufacturers Association and published under the title "Future Highways and Urban Growth." This study, made by the traffic consulting firm of Wilbur Smith and Associates, considers the urban traffic situation in 1972, assuming that all Interstate System and other planned urban freeways are completed by that date. Its conclusion: the annual rate of urban freeway construction will thereafter have to be doubled.

The Interstate System plan called for building 5,000 miles of urban freeway during the 16 years from 1956 to 1972; the 1961 report calls for building an additional 5,600 urban miles during the 8 years from 1972 to 1980.

BAN CARS OR BEAT THEM TO TOWN?

After looking at traffic-plagued cities, some critics have proposed that private automobiles be banned altogether from their congested central areas—thus forcing would-be drivers onto public transportation.

This solution is hardly popular; yet it is very close to what is actually happening—with no formal law or regulation to keep cars out—in some larger cities today. Fewer than 5 percent of the people employed in Manhattan south of 60th Street, for example, drive their cars to work—not because many of those who don't aren't eager to drive in, but because a combination of clogged streets, bridges, and tunnels, inadequate parking facilities, and high parking charges bar their entry.

Similarly in Chicago, only about 12 percent of those entering the central business district in rush hour drive in. In other large cities the barriers to entry are more porous—but access is strictly rationed all the same. Though few officials will openly admit it, congestion is quietly accepted as the cheapest device for discouraging additional drivers from driving to town. Indeed, congestion is politically popular in an off-the-record way because you don't have to float a bond issue to finance it.

It is here that the true significance of San Francisco's BART system, described above, becomes apparent. The bay area proposes to solve its journey-to-work problems, not by banning cars or by making it excessively slow, costly, and unpleasant to drive, but by offering a cheaper, faster, more convenient, less irksome way to get to town.

The ideal urban transportation plan, almost everyone now agrees, would combine a rapid transit system of BART quality or better with a freeway system adequate to carry the rest of the traffic. These two aspects of a sound plan are not incompatible.

Chicago's Congress Street Expressway and rapid transit line is the pioneering example of combined planning. It is, for the most part, an 8-lane expressway with a 2-track rapid transit line, and space for a third track, down the median. Rapid transit requires only about one-fifth of the width of the right-of-way; yet it has a theoretical peak-hour capacity of 30,000 seated passengers in each direction per hour (60,000 in the peak direction if the third track is installed).

The expressway, occupying four-fifths of the right-of-way, begins to jam up when more than 8,000 cars (8,000 occupants) travel along it per hour in either direction. The expressway cost about \$188,500,000; the rapid transit line cost an additional \$36 million.

Two other new Chicago expressways also have space down the median for rapid transit, but funds to build the transit lines are lacking. Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C., similarly plan to use freeway medians for a portion of their transit lines. The moral for other cities is clear. If a new freeway is being planned to enter your downtown area, has adequate consideration been given to provide room along it for future transit needs?

PRETTY GOOD ISN'T GOOD ENOUGH

Opponents of rapid transit make a completely valid criticism of the Congress Street transit line arrangement. They point out that even though its 2-track transit line could carry 30,000 seated passengers per hour, it actually runs many fewer cars than its capacity would allow and thus attracts only 13,500 passengers, including standees, during the rush hour. Hence the automobile expressway continues to jam up. To appreciate what's wrong with the Congress Street transit line, and with most other public transportation in the United States today, let's compare Chicago's Congress Street line with San Francisco's BART standards.

First and foremost, 50 percent of the passengers on the Congress Street line must stand during the peak hour. Even for the riders who do find seats, comfort is far below BART standards. The cars are not air-conditioned for example. And the service is only technically rapid transit. Scheduled speeds range from 17 to 26 miles per hour, as compared with BART's 50 miles per hour (both including the time of stops at the stations).

Moreover, the Congress Street line is only 9 miles long; much of its potential patronage lies beyond its outer terminus. Where it does reach, there are inconvenient arrangements for handling passengers driven to the train by their wives, inadequate peripheral parking for those who want to drive to the station, and inadequate feeder buses to bring passengers to the train. At the other end of the line, Chicago's distribution system for carrying passengers to their destinations fails to serve a number of new midcity developments where the transportation demand is heaviest.

These shortcomings are typical of most mass transportation lines in the United States today. Indeed, many are much worse. Mass transportation is patronized mostly by people who do not own cars, by those who would prefer to drive to work but can't afford it, and by those who fear they won't be able to find a parking place or to afford those that are available.

Chicago could remedy Congress Street's transit shortcomings at relatively moderate cost—much less than the cost of an additional freeway. It could also build high-quality transit lines along its other freeways at moderate cost.

But opposition from railroad interests and the highway lobby blocked action on transit improvement in the 1961 Illinois Legislature. It boils down to this: commuters are not yet organized as effectively as the highway lobby is, nor are they as sure of what fits their best interest. For instance, they are often misled when automobile club executives and other opponents of rapid transit tell them that the

March 2

BART system and similar proposals will handle at most only 5 percent or so of the trips people want to make. The figures may be right, but the implication isn't. For the 5 percent of trips that modern transit can handle best are the all-important trips to and from work.

ROLE OF THE COMMUTER RAILROADS

Many suburban commuters face a different sort of transportation crisis. Their communities' problem does not take the shape of a monumental traffic jam or overcrowded transit, but rather a notice posted at the local railroad station that the line proposes to raise its fares or curtail its passenger service—or discontinue service altogether.

Commuters faced with situations such as these often band together to protest, or hire lawyers to protest for them, at Interstate Commerce Commission hearings and at State public utility commission proceedings. They also petition their local officials and State legislators to "save our commuter railroads" by relieving them of taxes and by paying them tax subsidies.

Philadelphia has pioneered a better solution to the commuter railroad problem. During the 1950's farsighted Philadelphia public officials, looking at a map of the Penn-Jersey metropolitan area, noted that the rights-of-way of the dozen or more commuter railroad lines fanning out in all directions from downtown Philadelphia and from Camden could be used to create a magnificent public transportation system—if the lines could be tied together and service standards raised. Hence, when the railroads serving Philadelphia began petitioning for fare increases and for permission to curtail service, the city countered with an alternative proposal.

It offered to buy service from the railroads in accordance with a carefully drafted contract. It would seek to supply top-speed, comfortable, air-conditioned, "Silverliners"—reputed locally to be the finest electric commuter cars in the United States today. These new cars would be added to existing schedules to shorten the intervals between trains and provide seats for more passengers. The railroads would be required to lower instead of raise their fares. Stations would be improved and additional parking provided around them. The city would foot the bills, with aid from a Federal demonstration grant.

The plan was tried initially on two commuter lines and proved so successful that it has since been extended to several more. Two neighboring counties, through the Southeastern Pennsylvania Compact (SEPACT), have now joined Philadelphia and the Federal Government in supplying the needed funds. Railroad commuters are getting better service for less money, and the rest of the city is benefited through fewer cars jamming the downtown streets and freeways. A similar plan has since been launched on some Boston commuter railroad lines.

The Philadelphia plan is important because of three major features that distinguish it from the usual "save our commuter railroads" pleas.

The subsidy is used directly for the benefit of railroad patrons, not to bail out railroad bondholders.

The plan does not just seek to maintain existing service. It assure more and better service at lower fares.

Every dollar spent—and this is the ingenious heart of Philadelphia's plan—brings the city and its suburbs one step closer to a consolidated, areawide rapid transit system capable of providing services close to BART standards.

In 1964, for example, John Bailey of SEPACT submitted a report showing how railroad rights-of-way could be utilized to provide a high speed 216-mile rapid transit system with Silverliner comfort, peripheral

parking, and convenient central-city distribution at a cost of only \$130 million. And \$27 million worth of this conversion program had already been completed. New cars had been purchased, peripheral parking provided, and other improvements made. As a result, Bailey's package could be completed for an additional cost of only \$103 million—less than the cost of building 8 or 10 miles of downtown freeway.

The Regional Plan Association has been developing a similar plan for New York city's commuter railroads.

WHAT'S THE ANSWER FOR YOUR CITY?

A surprising number of North American cities are now considering rapid transit proposals leading toward San Francisco-type service—and a few have already started building transit systems.

Toronto residents, for example, voted 10 to 1 for a new subway back in 1946. Trains rolled over the first 4.5 miles of the system in 1954—and success was so immediate and obvious that plans for expansion were promptly drafted. Some 6.5 miles are currently in operation—not very much, but enough to keep from 10,000 to 25,000 cars off Toronto streets each weekday. Construction now underway will provide 21 miles of transit by 1967, and future plans now call for 39 miles by 1980. Along with new transit construction, Toronto is also developing a computer-based traffic control system to handle the cars and trucks remaining on the streets with maximum efficiency.

Montreal is similarly building a new subway system—26.2 miles approved to date—after a mayor was elected on the platform: "Vote for me and get a subway."

Philadelphia voters last November approved, by a substantial margin, an \$87,300,000 bond issue to finance subway extensions. The Philadelphia-Camden rapid transit line is being extended into the south Jersey suburbs at a cost of \$50 million. And there is the pending proposal already described to convert 216 miles of Philadelphia's commuter railroad lines into a high-speed transit system approaching BART standards.

Atlanta has plans for a 65.4-mile rapid transit network. Voters last November approved a constitutional amendment that is the first step toward that goal.

Boston is planning major improvements with the help of State funds from a 2 cents a pack increase in the cigarette tax, imposed following a monumental traffic tieup in December 1963. Its old transit authority serving the city and 13 suburbs has been replaced by a new agency authorized to improve service to the city and 77 suburbs.

New York, Chicago, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh have plans for extending and improving their existing transit systems—but these plans fall short in varying degrees of San Francisco BART standards.

A few other cities—St. Louis, for example—have transit plans gathering dust in municipal office files, and several cities, such as Baltimore and Seattle, are beginning to get ready to make transit plans.

This optimistic review of North American transit progress is subject to one major qualification: All of the plans require public tax funds to subsidize construction; but to date only Toronto, Montreal, and San Francisco have firmly committed public funds in adequate amounts. Thus a tremendous field is waiting for action—not necessarily to rally support for BART-type public transit in every large city, but at least to examine the issues carefully and come up with reasoned support of some locally feasible solution to the transportation problem.

That Toronto, Montreal, and the San Francisco Bay area should be the leaders in laying money on the line for high-quality transit is hardly coincidence. "If you would make your city loved," said an ancient Greek proverb, "you must first make her lovable." Toronto, Montreal, and San Francisco have

made themselves lovable cities—and it is at least partly in an effort to preserve their inherent quality from the freeway and the parking lot that residents of these cities and their suburbs have been willing to tax themselves for rapid transit.

The presence of three Canadian cities on the list is also worth a comment. American cities facing a choice between downtown freeways and rapid transit are deterred from choosing transit, even when it makes excellent sense, by our national freeway financing program. Since 90 percent of the cost of the new urban freeways included in the Interstate System and 50 percent of the cost of most urban freeways in excess of the Interstate System come out of the Federal "highways trust fund," even cities that want and need rapid transit have to date been tempted by the Federal carrot to build more freeways instead.

A change is in sight, however. The Urban Mass Transportation Act passed by Congress in 1964 establishes a national policy of aiding public urban transportation. If adequate funds are appropriated to achieve the goals set forth in the 1964 act, cities may at last be free to plan their transportation in terms of sound engineering and public policy rather than in terms of which plan will draw the lushest Federal subsidy. The next report in this series will consider financing proposals in more detail.

The War in Vietnam—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., just recently returned from a trip to Vietnam.

A series of reports on conditions as he found them is now appearing in the Courier-Express. I am sure my colleagues will find Mr. Warren's observations very interesting and, with unanimous consent, I include the fourth part of the series in the Appendix of today's Record:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Feb. 24, 1965]

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, IV—RAID OF VIETCONG SUCCESSFUL

(By Lucian C. Warren)

(Guerrilla warfare traditionally is a series of small but deadly battles in which units of a regular army undertake to capture—or kill—detachments of irregulars hiding in and living off the countryside. Here Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, accompanies a detail of South Vietnam soldiers in a successful raid on a nest of Vietcong guerrillas.)

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"The idea is to get your man in there as quickly as possible and then clear out," barked the Marine officer at an eagle flight predawn briefing at Danang Air Base.

"If your chopper is hit and goes down, there probably can be a recovery. The second H-34 should go alongside and effect a rescue. Get the man and the guns and get out and don't worry about the chopper."

Not long afterward more than a score of H-34's took off from Danang Airbase on the first leg of what the Marines call an eagle flight, an operation designed to drive Com-

minist Vietcong forces out of jungle hiding places, capturing their equipment and killing off or capturing them.

RENDEZVOUS

First stop was a rendezvous at Tam Ky with the South Vietnamese 5th Regiment battalions, the forces which were to be flown into a Vietcong-infested area for the mop-up operation.

I was permitted to join a segment of the 8d Battalion of the 5th Regiment, whose foreign advisers were Warrant Officer Wallace Thompson, an Australian Army man from Sydney, and Staff Sgt. Donald J. Shepherd, of Springfield, Ill.

Not long after sunup, the choppers were quickly loaded with the Vietnamese soldiers. The ones in my craft—9 men with short haircuts, none over 5 feet 4 inches tall—talked in Vietnamese and seemed eager for the fray.

SMOKE SIGNAL

At 9:05 a.m., the choppers swung low over the northern Thang Binh area, south of the coastal city of Hoi Ana. A lead helicopter dropped a red smoke signal indicating the spot for the soldiers to be landed.

I disembarked with the soldiers and lost no time in running to the nearest stretch of scrubby evergreen growth.

We were not shot at. But the presence of the Communist Vietcong in the area was attested to within 15 minutes when armed "Hueys"—as they call the Bell UH1B helicopters—began blasting away at the enemy a couple of miles away.

ON THE RUN

Warrant Officer Thompson was in constant touch with the leaders of the operation via his walkie-talkie. As electrical rockets and machineguns kept up a steady fire from the Hueys ahead, we learned that some Vietcong were on the run, others had taken to foxholes, while still others were heading for the Truong Chiang River in hope of safety there.

At intervals of between 15 minutes to an hour, our segment of the attacking force moved up according to plan.

Vin Van Thong, commander of the 2d company, 3d Battalion, a slight, bespectacled Vietnamese, at each halt would take out his map, jabber over his walkie-talkie, then smile with satisfaction as the operation unfolded successfully.

DIGGER

"He's a good little digger," said Shepherd. "Digger" is the affectionate slang term applied to the Vietnamese soldier by their American advisers.

"Get him to tell you about his Sunday operation," added Thompson.

At one of the longer breaks in the moving up operation, Thong proudly recounted how on Sunday they had ambushed 120 Vietcong and captured, among other things, 57 Russian recoilless rifles, a 160 millimeter mortar, 6 Japanese machineguns, 4 M1 rifles, 3 submachineguns, and 6,000 meters of signal wire—all in all amounting to 1 ton of Vietcong war equipment that could no longer be used in their South Vietnam war of terror.

RESCUE

In halting English but glowing with pride, he told how a couple of days earlier he had helped conduct a successful evacuation mission for 200 Catholic Vietnamese refugees, who wished to be freed from Vietcong terrorism in their home territory.

A helicopter picked me up and returned me to Danang before the current Eagle Flight mission had been completed. But later an official communique noted these successful results: 42 Vietcong killed, 13 captured, and a large quantity of weapons seized, as against only 1 killed and 2 wounded of the South Vietnamese forces.

A small operation, but one of the signs that Uncle Sam and his South Vietnamese ally are learning a trick or two about guerrilla warfare.

The Principles of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 the 156th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, an impressive address on "The Principles of Lincoln" was delivered at a Lincoln Day dinner in West Lafayette, Ind.

The address was delivered by James E. Dornan, Jr., a member of the faculty of Purdue University, located in the Second Congressional District of Indiana, which it is my privilege to represent.

Abraham Lincoln, a man of all the people, was the first Republican President of these United States, and as we again honor his memory with a special reenactment of his second inaugural, under leave to extend my remarks I offer Mr. Dornan's excellent exposition of the principles which were Lincoln's guidelines, and which have been guidelines for the Republican Party through the years:

Mr. Chairman, Representative and Mrs. Halleck, distinguished guests at the head table, and my fellow Republicans, it is of course a great privilege and a pleasure to have the opportunity to address this distinguished assemblage on such an occasion. I am sure that you have all noted with satisfaction, as I have, the tremendous turnout; coming as it does on the heels of the thrashing which we received at the polls in November, the size of the crowd tonight indicates quite clearly that reports of the death of the Republican Party have been magnificent exaggerations, and augers well for the future.

Before beginning my formal remarks, I would like to express the hope that my appearance here this evening will serve to lay to rest a certain myth concerning university professors which has received rather wide circulation of late: It is not true that all professors of political science in the United States in the 1960's are liberal Democrats. And some of you may someday want to tell your grandchildren that on February 12, 1965, you actually saw and heard one who isn't.

As your county prosecutor, George Hanna, indicated in his very kind introduction, I am a transplanted easterner, who has left the State of his birth and taken up residence elsewhere not in order to run for the U.S. Senate—which as you are well aware is a very popular reason for changing residence these days; rather, I have come to Indiana to assume a teaching position on the faculty of a great university, and thereby to reside in the heartland of America—that part of America which, it seems to me, best represents in this age of collectivism the spirit of a free people, that part of America which nurtured the giant of history whose memory we honor here this evening. And we are assembled this evening to renew, to rekindle in ourselves, that spirit of a free America; and to renew it by recalling for ourselves once again Abraham Lincoln's contribution to its formation. By so doing, we hope to draw from it the strength to weather the serious hours ahead.

For there can be no doubt that these are serious hours—for us assembled at Purdue on this February 12, for all Republicans gathered at similar dinners across the Nation, for all Americans, for all mankind—and I shall therefore speak to you in serious tones.

A little more than six decades ago, halfway around the globe in Zurich, Switzerland, a bald and stocky middle-class lawyer wrote a short treatise which he entitled "What Is To Be Done." Released soon afterward to an unresponsive world, the little pamphlet was largely ignored by its intended readership, the working class of Europe, and totally unnoticed by the statesmen then presiding over the power centers of the West, its circulation, in fact, as James Burnham has noted, was restricted to a rather motley group of emigre revolutionaries scattered throughout the capitals and major cities of Europe. But ignored though it was, that short pamphlet contained a blueprint for world revolution whose course races on in today's world, virtually unchecked. Its past successes are revealed by a brief examination of a world atlas: 63 years after the publication of "What Is To Be Done," Marxism-Leninism—the revolutionary doctrine expounded within its pages—is more than a mere set of ideas; it is a way of life for nearly a billion people in 13 nations, whose territory covers nearly one-third of the total land surface of the earth. It is, moreover, the organizing doctrine for revolutionary parties in 75 additional nations—parties large and small, powerful and impotent—all engaged in an unceasing struggle to extirpate from the very face of the earth all other political doctrines and systems and movements, and to replace them with their own narrowly rigid version of the good society. The author of the pamphlet was, of course, the man we know as V. I. Lenin; and six decades after the publication of his treatise Americans who have never heard his name confront the consequences of his mind, his energy, and his fearful talent.

In fact, for better or for worse, the entire recent record of American foreign policy and indeed of world history is very largely the record of our attempts to understand and counteract those consequences.

You ask, What has all this got to do with our topic for this evening? Just this. Forty years, almost to the day, before the publication of Lenin's pamphlet, another middle-class lawyer—this one tall, rather slender, and anything but bald, put his pen to paper in Washington, D.C., and issued another in the long series of documents which together constitute America's political heritage, proclaiming that freedom is the ultimate political value for all mankind. That document we know as the Emancipation Proclamation, and its author is known to history as the Great Emancipator, not only because he freed the slaves, but because his entire life is testimony to the glory of a free society.

Lenin and Lincoln—wholly dissimilar in personal appearance, in manner of living, in political philosophy—alike only in the common first and last letters of their surnames, and in the symbolic equality which the thought of each has come to assume for the contending forces in the revolution of our time. It is normally thought that only communism offers the people of the world a revolution in the 20th century, but the truth is that the democratic way of life offers to mankind a far more profound revolution, promises, in short, a liberation of the human spirit unknown in world history. And the conflict between these two revolutions—the Communist revolution and the democratic revolution—represents the crisis of our age. It is a conflict which goes forward on many levels; but I would suggest that at its most fundamental level, it is a conflict of spirit—a conflict essentially moral in nature that will be won by that force which succeeds in convincing the greater number of men that its principles represent the common aspirations of humanity.

And what are the ingredients of the spirit of freedom, the principles which we offer in opposition to the oppressive dogmas of Marxism-Leninism? They are, I suggest, nothing more nor less than the principles

which inspired the political career of the first Republican President, and which constitute the Republican spirit today.

The highlights of that career are of course familiar to all of you, for they have been immortalized in poetry and in prose, in the legendary tales which are a part of the conventional wisdom of our society and in the ponderous tomes of our academicians. Every American knows of Lincoln's birth in the humblest of surroundings in the Kentucky Appalachian country; of his family's move west, like that of countless thousands of others in the period of our national migration, in search of the American dream; of his rallsplitting and boatman days in southern Indiana, where he spent the formative years of his life. Equally familiar is his early entrance into the rough and tumble world of Illinois Whig politics; his three-term service in the State legislature and his leadership of the Whig forces there, his thrilling—if unsuccessful—attempts to win election to the U.S. Senate, and his role in the founding of the Republican Party all mark him as one of the prominent political leaders in the long history of party politics in the United States. And, finally, history has ranked Lincoln among the greatest of Presidents, the savior of the Federal Union, whose resolute refusal to shrink from the use of force in defense of the right made possible the astounding growth of the American Republic in the last century, and our emergence on the international scene as a world power. All this is familiar to you, and I need not therefore try to emulate those who have written of his life more eloquently than can I.

But with the principles which inspired that career you may not be as intimately familiar; it unfortunately appears to be true that the Republican Party during the course of the past several decades has chosen to define its position most often in terms of immediate issues, and only rarely in terms of a carefully articulated body of fundamental principle. This, I believe, has cost us dearly; and as a contribution to the self-analysis in which our party is currently engaged, I would like to attempt a brief summary of the ingredients of the Republican spirit.

1. The Republican spirit is infused with a spirit of realism, infused with an awareness of the limits set by human nature itself to the achievement of the good, infused with a sense of the possible. The Republican knows that precisely because of the kind of being that man is, he will choose the wrong road as often as the right, he will neglect his obligations as often as he will meet them, he will abuse political power as often as he will employ it as the servant of justice. The Republican knows that precisely because of the kind of being that man is, utopian solutions to problems in the political and social order cannot work must, in fact, lead inevitably to disaster. And I remind you that the entire career of Abraham Lincoln reflects his own essential realism, his willingness to work with conditions as he found them, his refusal to commit himself to crusades for unattainable ends. Perhaps best indicative of his attitude—and least remembered today—was his fundamentally gradualist approach to the question of the abolition of slavery, reflected in his insistence that abolition ought to proceed at a pace which took into account existing conditions in the South. This insistence of Lincoln's, of course, earned him the lasting enmity of the radicals in his own party.

2. The Republican spirit includes a profound respect for history and for tradition. The Republican asserts that the pattern of future events will largely resemble those of the past, that history is one of our most reliable teachers, that what has worked well in the past is likely to work well, with appropriate modifications, in the future. Here let me remind you of Lincoln's profound respect for the work of the founders of the

American Nation, and his insistence that their work must not be undone, even at the cost of a bloody Civil War.

3. Upon his understanding of political reality and of history rests the concept of government and governmental power which lies at the core of the Republican's political position. Because of his understanding of human nature, the Republican knows that the social and economic injustice that lies all about us can only partially and gradually be eliminated through common action in this political order, and partially eliminated at that only after arduous and long struggle. He knows, moreover, with Lord Acton, that all power tends to corrupt—is likely to be abused—and that therefore the power of any man or group of men to direct the lives of others must be carefully circumscribed lest it degenerate into tyranny. And he knows that the record of several thousand years of recorded human history bears unimpeachable witness to the degeneration of political power into tyrannical government.

Therefore, the Republican spirit embodies a notable suspicion of the overly powerful state and a favorable disposition toward limited government, toward the separation, diffusion, and checking and balancing of political power rather than its concentration. Today's Republican believes with Abraham Lincoln that a government should do for its citizens only what its citizens cannot do for themselves. And so, too, the Republican is an ardent defender of the American constitutional system, which is characterized by a limited national government, by the principle of federalism, by a system of separation of powers and checks and balances; for the Republican believes that we have developed in the United States the best governmental system yet devised for the protection of freedom.

4. The Republican spirit rests on a belief in liberty—not only because the alternative promises unimaginable horror, but more importantly because the path of freedom is the only path to the fulfillment of the individual and to the achievement of that which man as a being is peculiarly capable, the only path which permits him to exercise those God-given faculties of soul and mind and body which set us apart from the apes. And the Republican spirit rests, also, on a belief in equality—not a suffocating equality, imposed from above, that would make every man like every other man, but moral equality and equality of opportunity, a guarantee to every individual that he shall receive the change to enjoy the blessings of liberty. And here once again Lincoln is our exemplar: for what is his life but a testimonial to the possibilities for achievement offered to the free man by a free society?

5. The Republican spirit manifests a belief in the need for order imposed by law, and for social responsibility on the part of government and citizen alike. Too aware of the moral ambiguity of human nature not to recognize that liberty can readily degenerate into license, the Republican insists on a most careful balancing of the claims of freedom and order, and demands that his government stand ready to protect the freedom of all against the abuse of freedom by some. And all Republicans acknowledge their obligation and the obligation of government to the unfortunate members of our society who, through no fault of their own, have been unable to share in the good life of a bountiful America. But we insist, as did Lincoln, that this obligation is to be fulfilled through the framework of a free society, and must never degenerate into a simple exercise in vote buying through promises of ever-larger expenditures from the public treasury.

6. And, finally, the Republican spirit is infused with respect for the free economy and for the right of property. This respect is founded on the recognition that freedom

is indivisible; that logically and historically economic freedom cannot be separated from other kinds of freedom; that economic power cannot be separated from political power; that economic power concentrated in the hands of government is just as immediate a threat to liberty as political power so concentrated. If freedom is to have any meaning at all, it surely must include the opportunity to employ to the full our talents and abilities, the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of our labor, the opportunity to accumulate wealth and to utilize it in accordance with our desires—all, of course, within a framework of social responsibility.

And on behalf of both these principles—respect for order and for property as the bulwark of the good society—Lincoln spoke eloquently throughout his public life. "There is no grievance," he said, "that is a fit subject for redress by mob law." And in one of the last public addresses of his life, his 1864 speech to the New York Workingmen's Association, he said: "Property is the fruit of labor—property is desirable—is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich, shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another; but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

These, I think, are the ingredients of the Republican spirit, the principles to which all Republicans are dedicated and which distinguished us from almost all Democrats, the principles which we offer in opposition to the spirit of collectivism rampant in today's world. And it is within the framework of these principles that the Republican seeks his solutions to the complex problem of 20th-century America: he looks long and hard at proposals for further expansion of national governmental responsibility for the lives of Americans; he favors instead expanding the scope of State and local and private responsibility in meeting social problems; moreover, he believes that in today's affluent society a good number of our problems can be met at those levels. The Republican, further, examines each problem on its merits, in search of a solution that is satisfactory within the framework of a free social order, and on this basis takes his stand on such issues as medicare, on poverty wars, on aid to education, on welfare. And in the course of this examination he looks with care at the possible effect of policy proposals on the American constitutional system—a system which in its original conception provided for the balanced distribution of governmental power among three branches of Government, and provided most of all for reasoned deliberation on public problems by a Congress of the people's representatives. And when the Republican examines that system today, he sees it under relentless attack by proponents of a political orthodoxy who favor a constant aggrandizement of presidential power, a steady reduction in the prerogatives of Congress, and a regularized usurpation by the Supreme Court of the legislative function. Against all this the Republican offers increasing resistance—as Lincoln himself had to struggle constantly in his time to maintain the balance of our constitutional system against those who would have made the President and the Supreme Court the pawns of a dominant legislature.

Now what do our critics say of the Republican spirit as it unfolds in the 1960's? First, they charge that the Republican spirit is essentially negative, that we oppose every attempt to deal with the complex forces at work in our time, and initiate no counter-proposals of our own. Well, let me remind you that Lincoln's political posture had its negative aspects, also: he opposed slavery,

aided South Vietnamese forces drove the Vietcong back into the jungle, the Thanh Quilians weren't overly cordial to their rescuers.

GRADUAL THAW

As a matter of fact, most of the villagers turned their backs on their rescuers during the first few days, convinced that the rescue operation was momentary and the dreaded Vietcong would eventually return.

But little by little the pacification forces showed they meant business. They brought in rice and medicine. A battalion was stationed there along with a number of APC's (armed personnel cavalry vehicles) as a means to keep the Vietcong away.

And when the rescuers finally erected a combination bamboo and barbed wire fortification around the main portion of town, the thaw became complete. The hamlet was considered totally pacified.

RED INFESTED

It was to this supposedly happy scene that I was escorted one afternoon by Maj. John D. Hamilton, of Niles, Mich., a U.S. senior adviser to South Vietnamese 4th Army Cavalry.

The road to Thanh Quit was along the nation's Highway Route 1 which connects Danang and Saigon over a 400-mile stretch of some Vietcong infested territory.

Although both Danang and Thanh Quit are considered pacified and relatively safe, the connecting road is not rated safe enough to travel without some form of protection. Hence two APC vehicles preceded and followed the jeep in which I rode, and there was one stretch of the road, where the jungle was only 200 yards away, that had been nicknamed the "bamboo shooting gallery" because of the fondness the Vietcong had for trying to pick off occupants of moving vehicles, particularly if they were recognized as Americans.

BAROMETERS

On this day, however, there were no incidents. As we entered the hamlet, little children waved gaily and shouted "Halloo, halloo, halloo."

"You can see," said the major, "how we're regarded. The attitude of the children is always a good barometer of how their parents feel."

Alas, the children's "halloos" were a bit deceptive, considering the state of the village that day. We stopped at the headquarters for the South Vietnamese battalion, and the major suggested we take a stroll through town.

"No, no," cried Capt. Pham Van Nghin, of the local South Vietnamese battalion, "Vietcong here, Vietcong here."

QUICK RETURN

In halting English, Captain Pham told his tale. For some reason most of the battalion had been moved elsewhere the day before, a fact that apparently the Vietcong intelligence was quick to gather in. They moved in quickly, cut the bamboo and barbed wire fortifications and began throwing their weight around. Even at this moment, some of the Vietcong were reported confiscating some of the town's goods at its marketplace.

Our caravan made a quick turnabout and returned to Danang. Each of us had a rifle ready to use; we wore bulletproof vests and the APC's had machineguns readied for action.

A LONG, HARD WAR

We made the trip back to Danang without incident, but the sudden unpacified state of the hamlet moved Major Hamilton to comment:

"This is a good example of why there is going to be no quick solution to this war."

"It is obvious it is going to be a long, hard war. It is difficult to get dramatic results of big, sustained victories."

EXPECTS TO WIN

"However, in the long run I think we are getting somewhere. I didn't come over here with the idea of losing this war, but winning it. I still have every hope of doing so, and in spite of what happened this afternoon I am not discouraged."

I learned later that the missing battalion personnel was returned quickly to the hamlet, the Vietcong chased out again and the barbed wire, bamboo fortification restored.

Pacification is a laborious, continuing, and repetitious process.

Noted Writer R. O. Beckman Gives Daily Lift to Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at a time when life is taking on a new aspect, when busier days reach a slower pace, when the senior citizens reaches retirement, he often finds that his conception of retirement differs from reality. Instead of facing the challenges of youth, the senior citizen may be faced with keeping his interest alive. Rather than give in to idleness of the mind, indifference to the world around him, many of our senior citizens today are like the youth of today—they have sought to preserve their enthusiasm, and have refused to give in to challenges.

One such person is Mr. R. O. Beckman, who's columns appear regularly in the Fort Lauderdale News, and who's audience is growing regularly as well. Mr. Beckman's writings offer inspiration to his readers, and give sound principles for living to young and old alike.

I include one of Mr. Beckman's columns in the RECORD at this point in order that he receive the widest possible readership:

BURDEN OF 70 YEARS NO REASON FOR BOREDOM

(By R. O. Beckman)

From a reader nearing the age of 70 come reflections about later life, which he and his wife regard as a bore. He writes:

"Have you ever thought how depressing it is to wake up every morning the same old person? Pulling on the same old pants or skirt for what will be just another day, brewing coffee in the same old pot? Then there's the difficult decision of whether you want your eggs boiled, poached, fried, or scrambled. (Why doesn't someone devise some new ways?)

"From force of habit you scan the morning paper or turn on the wireless, only to learn of more grisly deaths on the highway, juvenile delinquents that have run amok or more slaughter in Vietnam or the Congo. After coffee, you automatically reach for one of the brand of cigarets you smoked for 15 years.

"Passing a mirror on her way to the kitchen, the wife makes a face and remarks she looks like an old hag. You can't decide whether it would be unconvincing to say she doesn't, or too early in the day to start an argument by agreeing with her. Time drags along through the day. No phone

calls or visitors and no mail except for advertising that's unwanted. The clock chimes every hour but nothing happens. We may recall the joys of the good old days or renew a long-standing argument as to whether to cash in on some stock we own or leave it to relatives since we have no children. And so to bed—exhausted from killing time."

If this couple is truly as bored as the letter implies, it is high time to take a fresh look at the mixed frustrations and blessings of life in the 1960's. Without a mental shot of adrenalin, they will be senile in no time. This can be avoided by snapping out of humdrum and ho-hum, effecting a change in ideas and scene, and extending their interests. Changes in daily routine, new outside contacts, travel, community service—these lend new purpose, meaning, and depth to life. A person who looks backward too often may turn into a pillar of salt like Lot's wife.

LIVE IT UP

Why deplore or laugh at youth for its affections or mistakes? It is generally trying on one face after another to find its own. Why should the couple not spend extra savings to bring pleasure to themselves and others? Cicero once asked if anything could be more absurd than to multiply luggage as one nears a journey's end.

Dr. Harlan Hatcher, University of Michigan president, has a word of comment which fits age as well as youth.

"The easiest way is to live listlessly on a dead level of monotony, or to drift with the accepted and the expected into quiet desperation. The next easiest is to consume your energies in undirected revolt or rebellion or starve them in cynicism and unbelief. The most difficult and most rewarding is to combine knowledge and understanding of the requirements for change with those golden moments of clear visitation and faith in what it is possible for man to become. This is the source of joy and the excitement of the creative spirit which lifts us to a higher level where richer values and delightful colors surround and support our lives."

Award for Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, recently the Revere Journal, a newspaper which has covered the news for the citizens of Revere, Mass., in an objective and skilled manner, since 1881, won the first place award for general excellence among weekly New England newspapers having over 5,000 circulation.

The award was made on behalf of the New England Weekly Press Association by President John T. Hough at the association's annual award dinner in Boston. More than 300 publishers, editors, and other members of the organization were there, including Postmaster General John Gronouski, to see a panel of eight distinguished fellows of the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University award first place to the Journal on the basis of its "all-round outstanding attributes and high professional standards."

I am particularly pleased to see the Journal recognized in this way, Mr.

Dr. Gustavo Bounous, an Italian immigrant to Canada. Dr. Bounous lived for a short time in America but was forced to move to Canada when his temporary visa ran out. Mr. Maurice R. Marchello, an attorney in Chicago, uses the case of Dr. Bounous to show how the national origins quota system works to the detriment of the United States.

I recommend these informative articles to all of my colleagues; therefore, with unanimous consent, I insert them in the Appendix of the Record.

The articles follow:

DR. BOUNOUS STORY—WE LOST HIM

TORONTO.—Montrealer Gustavo Bounous, dynamic example of brain drain at work in Canada's favor, received a top national medical award here last night for shedding a bright new light on how shock from bleeding causes death.

Dr. Bounous' work, which won him the medal in surgery from the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, opens up the possibility of saving patients who succumb to hemorrhagic shock despite transfusions.

An Italian surgeon trained in Turin, Dr. Bounous, 36, moved to Montreal early in 1962 from Indianapolis when he was forced to leave the United States because his temporary visa ran out.

Working with laboratory dogs, Dr. Bounous tackled the puzzle of why early transfusions and treatment save patients in shock from bleeding but fail after a certain time that varies from person to person.

Dr. Bounous found that the chemical structures of cells in the lining of the bowel change in a state of shock until they reach a point where they can no longer accept oxygen. This cell exhaustion weakens the bowel lining, permitting poison body waste to escape and kill.

Putting dogs into a state of shock by loss of blood, he measured the ability of intestine cells to accept oxygen at intervals. He found that chemical changes gradually reduce the ability to take oxygen from the blood. The enzyme substance that permits the transfer of oxygen from blood to cell finally is depleted, causing complete breakdown of the cell.

If medical science can isolate and identify precisely what chemical is depleted in shock, it might someday be possible to give patients, who fail to respond to transfusions, a life-saving injection of the chemical.

CONGRESSMEN MUST ACT NOW—BIASED IMMIGRATION POLICY IS BRAIN DRAIN TO UNITED STATES

(By Maurice R. Marchello)

We as Americans of Italian origin do not envy Canada's gain in acquiring a fine citizen, but we are deeply concerned with the loss to America of such exemplary citizen prospects, due entirely to the shortsighted laws which limit and restrict them from entering our country.

We respectfully submit that all Americans should be equally concerned with this "brain-drain"—especially our Congressmen, who now have the power to correct it.

One can only conjecture how great this brain loss must have been over the past years. Just try to imagine what a tragic loss of talent our country would have suffered in the past 30 vital years if the Italian-born Fermi, Fubini, and Conto—to mention a few outstanding scientists—had to cope with the quota system to gain admittance to our country.

Fortunately, these three brilliant contributors to our country, because of their special circumstances, were able to avoid the immigration quota law restrictions.

Enrico Fermi, the father of the atomic and nuclear age, was accorded political sanctuary

in our shores because he was an anti-Fascist exile.

Eugene C. Fubini, the valuable Assistant to our Secretary of Defense McNamara, and who controls our military communications satellite program was admitted outside the quota because his wife was an American citizen.

The late Chicagoan, Armando F. Conto, a television pioneer and a well-known figure in communications engineering, also was admitted as a nonquota immigrant because he was fortunate enough to have married an American citizen, whom he met in Europe when she was a student of foreign languages.

Congress now has the opportunity with presidential sanction to abolish forever the hypocrisy of our antiquated immigration policy. The quota system based on where a man is born has too often damned the gifted equally with the deprived.

American immigration policy should serve the best interests of Americans. While specifically we are now pointing up the hard plight of the humble, talented Italian prospective immigrants, we ask no more for them than we do for others, regardless from whence they come.

There is also the great need to correct, with compassion, certain wrongs done in the past. The agonizing separation of families brought about by the old quota system also is a strong consideration for the passage of the proposed legislation.

Basically, the recommended legislation gives equal treatment to all. So, let us now search not only in the heretofore favored lands of the Nordic Anglo-Saxons, but let us also climb the hills of Rome and Turin and explore the Mediterranean shores where, in the future, perhaps another Fermi, Fubini, and Conto type immigrant will add luster to the American firmament.

And when Congress does its rightful duty as urgently requested by our President and enacts the new legislation, the sad story of the U.S. loss of Dr. Gustavo Bounous will not be repeated.

Taking Off—In-Flight Movies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, because there have been some recent news reports on the possibility of prohibition of in-flight movies on the North Atlantic run, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a timely and cogent article in the February issue of American Aviation.

The article follows:

TAKING OFF

(By William V. Henzey)

It is doubtful if there ever has been a single addition to onboard service so well received by the public as in-flight entertainment. And few industry moves have been so productive of beneficial results.

As a result, it is difficult to get excited about the opposition to movies, stereo, et al. by some airlines. The opposition has been synthetic. It had its biggest heyday during the IATA traffic conference in Athens last fall.

But could there have been a carrier in the group who seriously thought the in-flight entertainment wave could be rolled back? A ban by IATA, or any other group, on movies would have drawn the wrath of the public down on the association and its members. In fact, we doubt that the govern-

ment agencies involved, particularly our CAB, would have done less than boot a field goal with the appropriate resolution.

Some carriers talked about the added cost of installing movie and stereo equipment and indicated that once socked into the structure it would ultimately find its way into higher fares. This is ridiculous. Of course there is an added installation cost. But it's peanuts in the overall picture.

An airline that would raise the cost angle would add from \$1 million to \$5 million to its annual advertising budget without batting an eye. And if the relatively minor cost is worrisome to some carrier, let it cut down on the supply of booze on its flights (but not too far).

The fact is, no airline protest was advanced with the idea that it would be successful. Airline traffic and marketing men will tell you their longtime regular passengers were switching to the competitor who was showing a movie they hadn't seen.

But it goes beyond drawing passengers from one carrier to another. TWA's Tom McFadden put it well recently when he said, "In-flight movies are the greatest contribution to passenger relaxation since the advent of pressurized cabins."

McFadden's point is that the tensions of first-time riders are eased and boredom on long flights is relieved. And what an impact it must have on those who haven't yet flown to realize that somewhere, 5 or 6 miles up going just under the speed of sound, thousands of people are oblivious to everything but James Bond's newest device for mayhem.

Yes, in-flight entertainment is here to stay and it will spread throughout the world's airlines before the year is out.

✓ The War in Vietnam—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the fifth part of a report on Vietnam by Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., which follows:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Feb. 25, 1965]

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, V—REDS ENTER PACIFIED HAMLET

(In warfare it sometimes becomes difficult to sustain victory after a battle has been won, and this is especially so in guerrilla warfare. Here Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, discovers how resilient are the Red Vietcong of the southeast Asia jungles and how communities captured from them refuse to stay pacified. This is the fifth in a series by Warren on his firsthand experiences in South Vietnam.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A pacified hamlet, in the language of U.S. military advisers and the South Vietnamese Government, is one which has been successfully wrested from the Communist Vietcong.

Such, supposedly, is the hamlet of Thanh Quít, where a few thousand South Vietnamese peasants reside in a 2-square-mile area, 12 miles south of Danang, the nation's second largest city.

There is no doubt that Thanh Quít was for many months in the grip of the Vietcong. So much so, in fact, that when superior U.S.-

Speaker. The managing editor and publisher of the Journal, Mr. Sidney Curtis, his editor, Mr. Robert Long, and their staff have maintained a high degree of excellence in serving their community both as a source of public information and as a forum for constructive expression on the part of their readers. I am pleased to make their recent honor known to my fellow Members of the Congress and to point out that the Journal is an example of the kind of reporting which makes our democratic form of government a working reality.

I include at this point a reprint of the editorial which appeared in the Journal acknowledging this award:

WE ARE PROUD

It was with a deep sense of personal pride and humility that the publisher and editor of the Revere Journal accepted the first place award for general excellence at the New England Weekly Press Association Annual Awards Dinner last weekend.

Competition for the award presented to the winner for "all-round outstanding attributes and high professional standards" is keen. The judging in the contest was done by fellows of Nieman Foundation at Harvard University and in being declared the winner in its class the Journal is justifiably proud.

We are proud for many reasons. Each week we endeavor to give to the people of this community a newspaper encompassing all the events occurring in our city—from city council and school board sessions to the meetings of the Girl Scouts and other organizations. In these stories we deal only with the facts as they happen and reserve our opinions for our editorial columns.

In an effort to see that the finished product is pleasing to the eye and easy to read, Publisher Curtis has established a typesetting plant that is second to none. It features the latest equipment and makes the typography of this newspaper one of the best to be found anywhere. Even as this is being written the publisher is on a business trip seeking to purchase an offset press so that the readers of the Journal will be presented their news in the latest and most modern manner.

However, while we have all the material resources at our command, it still takes the hard work and dedication of a loyal group of employees to publish a prize-winning weekly.

The enthusiasm and tempo necessary to meet this goal is furnished by Publisher Curtis. He strives for perfection in every endeavor and will never walk away from a fight. He sets a hard hitting policy and in following his leadership we have been able to publish a top weekly newspaper that is looked upon with respect and admiration.

One of the Nieman fellows who served as a judge in the contest in a panel discussion said the Journal showed "great enthusiasm for local coverage and its stories were beautifully developed. It also showed it was a real crusading newspaper and backed up its fight for better government with strong editorials." Another of the judges stated the Journal "was well-written and its production was excellent."

We are proud of the honor that has been bestowed upon us. We attempt to give our readers the best paper possible each week and the presentation of this award assures us that we are fulfilling this obligation—we will continue to extend our efforts in order to prove that we are worthy of this high consideration.

Good Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning speech written by Miss Linda J. Thyne, of Babbitt, Nev., which she entered in the Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" contest, this year. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

The text of speech follows:

GOOD CITIZENSHIP

There has probably never been a time in our history when our citizenship was the subject of more widespread and anxious concern than today.

There is always the danger that we may think of our citizenship too narrowly. When we think of citizenship, we are likely to think of voting, or of serving on a jury, or of our services as public officers, or of paying taxes, or of the possibility of being drafted into the Army as soldiers. These are the specific tasks of the citizen and each is of the highest importance, but back of them stands living—living so that life shall be good and full, free and worth of the human race.

You cannot separate your citizenship and the exercise of your civic duties from the rest of your life. Your aspirations, interests, ideals, tastes, and habits influence the performance of your civic duties. If your life is noble and rich, your citizenship will express that nobility. If you are dishonest in your thinking and indifferent to the well-being of others, these qualities will degrade your citizenship.

Religious ideals have been called the foundation of citizenship. Citizenship finds its fullest expression in the roots of religion, which has ever emphasized the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. God gave man free will. Will to do what he pleases. Each person can make his own decision whether or not he wants to take up the challenge of citizenship.

One of the safeguards of citizenship is education. The American citizen has always had complex domestic problems to solve and to act upon. We now have, in our schools, 30 million young people who not only face domestic issues but who must become global minded. Our country and the world is changing so rapidly that new problems of life and government arise overnight and if we are to meet them with full intelligence, we must continue our study and education throughout our years.

We hear much conversation about the tremendous progress that we have made in our country, and we have. We certainly have made material progress. But where are we really in some respects? Namely, in the respect of citizenship?

Although man's inventions are getting bigger and faster, it does not necessarily follow that man himself is getting better. While we have become a nation of technological giants, we are also rapidly becoming a nation of spiritual midgets. Morality is determined by self-interest. "What's best for

me" is the philosophy pursued by far too many people.

Good citizenship includes a better human understanding, a better communication between peoples, a better appreciation of our American free enterprise system and a radically changed attitude toward government and political processes.

It is the citizen's obligation to cherish and improve the great inheritance of democracy and self-government. There must be a reawakening on the part of all our people in their concern for individual liberty and freedom of initiative.

I believe that the dearest possession common to everyone of our 186 million people—is his citizenship. But I believe that the priceless privilege carries with it the duty as well as the challenge of defending our national honor, welfare and security by every means necessary.

An anonymous poet was right when he said:

"Let no one tell you as you grow
That nothing to the flag you owe,
Let no one whisper that it means,
But pleasant days and peaceful scenes,
And merely calls to mind a land,
Where wealth abounds on every hand,
Because no more that flag will fly,
When men for it refuse to die."

Voice of Democracy Contest Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a splendid "Voice of Democracy" essay, written by a fine young man in my district, the Second Congressional District of Louisiana. Mark Stephens, a student at Litcher High School in Litcher, La., has been chosen the winning contestant in my State in this annual essay contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Young Mark Stephens now has the opportunity to compete with contest winners from the 50 States for four scholarship prizes: A \$5,000 scholarship, first prize; a \$3,500 scholarship, second prize; a \$2,500 scholarship, third prize; and a \$1,500 scholarship, fourth prize. These prizes will enable deserving high school students, who have written the top essays, to help defray their expenses for their first year in a college or university of their choice.

The VFW is to be commended for sponsoring this "Voice of Democracy" contest—which provides young people in high schools across the Nation with the opportunity to think seriously about the meaning of democracy and to write stimulating essays on their personal views of our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for inclusion in the RECORD this thought-provoking essay on democracy by Mark Stephens of Litcher:

March 2

A904

(By Mark Stephens, Litcher, La.)

The American system of government is based on the belief that most of the people will be mostly right most of the time. The fate of America, for better or for worse, is entrusted to the judgment and mercy of the majority. But in the deeper sense, I believe that the trust is meant to be shouldered by each individual and that all the individuals, working together must produce solutions to our problems.

Through the years our faith in the conscience of America has been well placed; but often, prejudice, bigotry, and fear in individuals have led people into large partisan groups fighting selfishly for their own interests. Good judgment has suffered and will continue to suffer because of this selfishness. Usually our voting has resulted in a middle-of-the-road approach to problems. But when fair and reasonable policy is adopted, using the good points from all sides, is it really always the result of the wishes of a tolerant, reasonable majority of the voters and leaders? I believe that much of the so-called "reason" today results from unreasonable people clashing together so hard that none gets his way entirely.

I really believe that on several occasions our country has lived in spite of its citizens and leaders, in spite of their ignorance in grasping the most important challenge confronting American citizens. That challenge is to put emotions and reason into their proper perspective and to make judgments based on intelligence and humanity. Men often forget that emotional inspiration is a gift and not a cause. It can give us energy, but it cannot be allowed to control our thinking. History teaches us that men are too diverse to be satisfied with one opinion. Judging many opinions requires a clear head.

Our Government was designed to allow us to use the minds of many men. The Founding Fathers set up a system that allows us to pick the best from these many minds and permits us to use it to set up government policy. Certainly the authors of the Constitution realized that most ideas worth mentioning in Congress would be worth fighting for and that even if men changed their positions on issues, it would not be because they had changed their minds. The system of compromise allows these men to do what is best for America. But I do not think that we really give this system its best chance to work unless we are reasonable in our loyalty to party, State, and political belief. If a man is a liberal for the sake of being a liberal and always votes liberally and is always suspicious of anything that might be called conservative, he will cheat himself of any good conservative beliefs.

I believe that there is too much of this prejudice today between parties and sections of the country. The challenge of reason has yet to be met completely. Certainly most people are not too extreme, but too many people are, and too many extremists influence our thinking, and too many extremists are our spokesmen. This situation clouds the issues and makes so much of our work nearsighted and intolerant. Those who really believe that this country could ever become completely liberal or conservative and stay completely liberal or conservative and still survive, miss one point in history: That life, for people or for nations, is like a pendulum; it swings both ways and we have to be ready to swing with it when necessary.

If we are to use our system of free thought and choice so that we can meet the many different types of problems, each individual American must clear the air around him as much as possible and find a good set of values. As long as our opinions are shaped so much by narrow thinking, we shall never be able to go left when we need to go left, or right when we need to go right, or quickly

or slowly. We shall rise and decline and we may fall, like so many other nations before us. When the voice of patriotism is a psychiatric case who warns us to arm for protection against the Supreme Court, when the spokesman for a wise and necessary belief such as States' rights is an arrogant, crude insensitive racist; and when the voice of equality comes from a screaming rioter in the streets, this blindness is a real threat.

But in the same fundamental reasons that we have for believing in God, we find cause for hope, hope that Americans, now and tomorrow, will support the cause of sane, humane judgment and that America's promise can become its future.

Virginia Winner of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech on the subject of "The Challenge of Citizenship, 1964-65" that won first prize in the State of Virginia in the annual Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Its author is C. Linwood Duncan, of Danville, Va., in my congressional district.

More than 250,000 high school students participated in this contest, which has as prizes scholarships ranging in value from \$1,500 to \$5,000. The winning contestant from each State will come to Washington on March 9 for the final judging.

In his speech which won in the Virginia competition, my young constituent, I am proud to say, has shown a deep understanding of the subject. He has worded his thoughts in an interesting manner, profound with the principles on which this Nation has been built, and with considerable originality. I hope they may be widely read at this time of international strife when they have such a special meaning.

The speech follows:

The moment of truth—December 7, 1941—war fell on the United States of America. A spontaneous reaction occurred and recruiting offices were jammed as the citizens of America rallied to defend their Nation, from which they had reaped such fullness of life and such purposeful living. Now, this America, founded by the greatness of statesmen with patriotic love in their hearts, was witnessing a surge of an appreciative people. These people arose to the occasion to fight to preserve the inalienable rights established by their forefathers, those forefathers who had refused to be lured into complacency by mercenary demagogues.

In retrospect the year 1776 saw a small group of stalwart immigrants of assorted nationalities establish an infant among nations. These people knew what it was to be suppressed and to feel the iron hand of tyranny upon their shoulders. The one goal of these pioneers was to carve out a land which, after they had molded it into one dedicated to honesty, integrity, and forbearance, would enable them to glean from it the rewards due a citizen of a free country. It was Alfred Lord Tennyson who wrote, "Our vista ever widens as we move." Undoubtedly, this must have been the unwrit-

ten code of the early American pioneer. With heart undaunted and his face turned toward the unknown frontier, he pushed the mountains and forests back, conquered the unbridled rivers, and strode across gaping gorges and burning sands. So determined were his efforts that the tiny handful of colonies became the domain of freemen and the harbor of all those seeking refuge from border to border and from sea to sea, that he pushed onward and onward. The spirit of these early pioneers was carried on for over 165 years. Man fought and died for America's cause; they did not take the advantages afforded them by citizenship for granted, but were determined to use every means they had to preserve these cherished possessions for future generations.

The position that this country holds as a leader of nations in the world today may well be attributed to the strong men and women who, over the years, have fought to build a national integrity in an effort to forge a firm foundation. For history has repeatedly shown that no civilization survives without such. Is America still the land of such strength that even a struggling young nation can look to her for guidance and inspiration? Daily on our spinning globe, which teems with unrest, this question is being asked, as one by one nations buckle under the deteriorating and undermining forces of communism, socialism, apathy, and complacency. The answer to that question is not an unquestionable yes. However, one must give serious consideration to the part that today's American youth must play to make it a positive yes. Are young Americans of this generation willing to accept the enormous responsibilities handed to them by their forebears; those of safeguarding America's greatness and unlimited opportunities? Can young America, despite a codded existence, in which a picture of uncomplicated and simple life has seemingly given the impression that the world is floating on a rosy cloud, face the facts of strengthening themselves and their Nation? If so, the United States of America can maintain its rightful place in the sun as a nation under God, with strength from God, a nation which still leads in the fight against tyranny and slavery.

As youth, we must not balk at the thought of adhering to tradition and methods which may ostensibly seem old-fashioned, for there are principles of life which are ageless. By the same token, we cannot afford to ignore new and progressive ideas. The price of freedom and citizenship is dear, hence not one of us can stop here and feel secure. We must be on the move constantly, ever widening our vistas until the world is purged of festering sores and all men alive can be blessed with the broadest concept of citizenship, which provides for the human dignity of man.

The War in Vietnam—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include another installment in the series by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, covering his recent observations in Vietnam. Mr. Warren is Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., and part

VI of his report which appeared in this newspaper on February 26, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, VI—WILL TO WIN

VITAL FACTOR

(By Lucian C. Warren)

(Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, is paying an adventurous visit to troubled South Vietnam where he has seen some of the fighting between Government troops and Vietcong guerrillas. Here two high American officers, one of them a western New Yorker, discuss for him what it will take to pacify a country widely infiltrated with an experienced and determined enemy. Principally, they say, it will take U.S. persistence and will to victory in the face of temporary discouragement.)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—“If we have the effort, willpower and desire to win this war, then we'll win it.”

“Those were the words of a man who should know, the man directly in charge of bossing American military efforts in South Vietnam—Brig. Gen. William E. De Puy, whose formal title is assistant chief of staff of the American military command for operations.

A man directly beside him, in the U-8 twin engine Army plane en route from Danang to Saigon, nodded agreement.

“I concur wholeheartedly,” said Lt. Col. Donald D. Doerflein, formerly of Kenmore, N.Y., De Puy's executive assistant. “We can win if we'll just make up our mind to do so.”

WORRY CITED

But what worries these two able military men is some kind of psychological letdown like Dienbienphu, the French military disaster that convinced the French that their cause was hopeless. The resulting negotiations resulted in the splitting of Vietnam at the 17th parallel, with the northern half going to the Communists.

“That defeat for the French wasn't as bad as it was cracked up to be,” said De Puy. “All was by no means lost in a military sense. But it turned out to be a major psychological blow to the French will to win and they pulled out. That must not happen to us.”

REDS DISCIPLINED

As he talked, De Puy looked out over the rugged, mountainous territory.

“See that,” he said as he pointed to a whitish patch on a mountainside. “That's rice being cultivated the hard way by the Vietcong on the mountainside. What we're up against is disciplined, ruthless, and highly dangerous Communist organization.”

And with a touch of sadness in his voice, he added: “And the South Vietnamese we are working with are a people belonging to all kinds of sects, living in a newly created nation that has no traditions and no clear idea of a civil service. When they get the proper leadership, they're wonderful fighters, but the problem is to get the right leadership.”

DOERFLEIN RETURNING

De Puy and Doerflein had just spent the morning in Danang, the nerve center for military operations in the northern area of South Vietnam, not far from the demilitarized border zone.

An association of some months between the two men was to be shortly terminated because Doerflein had about completed his year's tour of duty in South Vietnam and will be returning in early March to Washington, where he will have new duties with the Office of Research and Development of the Defense Department at the Pentagon.

AREA NATIVE

Doerflein has deep roots in the Buffalo area, where he was born and brought up. His grandmother is Mrs. Catherine Doerflein, of 811 East Ferry Street, Buffalo, and his father, Peter L. Doerflein, a retired salesman, is now living in Silver Spring, Md.

A rangy 6-footer whose head scraped the top of this Army executive plane, Colonel

Doerflein has fond memories of a Niagara frontier boyhood that culminated in graduation from Kenmore High School in 1943.

From then on he was a rolling stone gathering little moss, particularly in the matter of a college education.

ATTENDED UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO

Because of military service interruptions, the colonel helped himself, cafeteria style, to a college education where it was most convenient, including a 1½-year start at the University at Buffalo, followed by stints at Princeton, the University of Kansas, and the University of Omaha.

The prize finally was a bachelor of education degree at Omaha. His wife is the former Bernice Jarosz, of Buffalo, now residing with their three children at Tucson, Ariz.

Doerflein listened attentively as his chief expounded his views on the political-military situation in Saigon. Like a good executive assistant should, he let the boss do the talking, but it was clear that he was of like mind.

GENERAL'S COMMENT

What obviously bothered both De Puy and Doerflein most was the attitude of the folks back home.

“The people back home just don't have a clear picture of the picture here,” complained the general, “and what would happen with a Vietcong victory. They're falling right into the trap set by the Communists, who have figured all along that Uncle Sam is a paper tiger.

“I still think we're going to stick this one out and win, but if we don't no one in this part of the world will ever believe us again and the other still free countries in this area can quickly become Communist.”

ASSESSMENT

The general was asked for a frank assessment of the current military situation. In reply, he did not try to paint a rosy picture. As he sees it, the South Vietnamese forces with American help have the Vietcong clearly on the run in the southern or delta area of South Vietnam, where 10 million of the nation's 12 million live. The area immediately around Saigon has been well disinfecting of the Vietcongs.

But De Puy acknowledged that the Vietcong at present have the upper hand in South Vietnam's central highland, while in the northern Danang area, there is presently a military standoff or stalemate.

TIME ON OUR SIDE

But in the long run, if the United States and South Vietnamese don't in the meantime lose their nerve, the general feels reasonably certain of victory. This is even attested by the attitude of interrogated Vietcong prisoners, who fear defeat in any long war.

The general summed it up: “In general there is more good news than bad news. And don't forget that time is on our side. It may take anywhere from 5 to 10 years, but this war can be won and it must be won.”

I have filed for the purpose of limiting presidential campaigns to 60 days. CBS has an important and a responsible role in every national election campaign and it is encouraging to those of us who are pressing for action in the House to know that Mr. William S. Paley, chairman of the board, and Mr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., share our hope that we will achieve this objective.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include herewith letters which I have received from Messrs. Paley and Stanton:

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 12, 1965.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: Thank you very much for your letter of February 5, enclosing copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 4 and other material relating to your proposal for a constitutional amendment which would limit the presidential campaign period to 60 days.

I certainly share your hope that some step will soon be taken to achieve this objective which we both have been advocating for some time now.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. PALEY.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 15, 1965.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: It was kind of you to write your letter of February 4. I was delighted to read your insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not only on February 3, which you forwarded to me, but your further insert on February 4. I am pleased indeed that you support the principle of shorter presidential campaigns.

As we at CBS have pointed out in the past, the direct and immediate way to accomplish this desired end of shortening presidential campaigns would be for the political parties themselves to come to an agreement on later convention dates and hence shorter campaigns. Perhaps this simple procedure is too direct and it is too optimistic to expect it to be adopted. Your resolution (H.J. Res. 16) may be the slower but more certain way of accomplishing what seems to us to be a most desired goal. CBS fully supports your objective.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK STANTON.

Ed Freeman Made a Strong Mark at
Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding citizen in Tennessee, Ed Freeman, has just been made a managing editor of a great newspaper of the Nation, the Nashville Tennessean. I had the privilege and honor of being in college with Ed over 30 years ago.

CBS Officials Favor Shorter Presidential Election Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the two highest officials of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., have assured me of their continuing interest and support for House Joint Resolution 16 which

Bill Powell, an outstanding writer on the Paducah Sun-Democrat at Paducah, Ky., has prepared an excellent article on Ed Freeman. I am greatly indebted to Representative FRANK ALBERT STUBBLEFIELD, from whose district Ed Freeman came, and Representative DICK FULTON, who represents the district where Ed lives.

Ed Freeman has certainly made a success due to his outstanding capabilities and determination to work and to do a good job whatever his task might be.

The article follows:

BILL POWELL'S NOTEBOOK: ED FREEMAN MADE A STRONG MARK AT MURRAY

When I went to Murray State College in 1938 Ed Freeman had already graduated. I heard a lot about him in a short time, however. Freeman was one of the favorites of our journalism teacher, L. J. Hortin, and he always got around to Ed quickly in trying to convince some of us that the lean times should not discourage us or make us drop out of college.

He admired Ed very much; Hortin had me admiring Ed long before I met him.

Freeman, to him and then to me, was symbolic of the poor youngster getting through college and making fine grades without having any backing at all.

Ed fired somebody's furnace and slept in a basement room to meet some of his college expenses. He also worked on a National Youth Administration job for a small monthly check. He worked anywhere he could and managed to pay his way, although there were many weeks when Ed didn't have a nickel in his pockets.

But it wasn't that Ed was just a hard-worker; he made brilliant scholastic marks and was one of the highest respected boys on the campus for the way he behaved and the way he treated people.

He was intensely serious, though, and never seemed to have time to play.

"Ed smiled some but I don't believe I ever saw him laugh," Bob Sanderson, our associate editor who was in school when Ed was, told me.

Ed graduated from Calvert City High School in the early 1930's and finished his Murray work in 1937.

When I got to Murray in the fall of 1938 Ed was working for the Murray Ledger and Times. He later became editor of the paper, which was a weekly at the time.

Then in 1940, while I was working on the College News and the National Youth Advocate, a small paper put out for the NYA students at Murray under the direction of the late Emerson Crowley, Ed answered a "help wanted" ad in Publishers Auxiliary. He got a job on a Spokane, Wash., daily but didn't have the money to pay his way there.

Ed didn't hesitate a moment said L. J. Hortin. He packed a little suitcase and started thumbing rides. He made good time across the country and was soon at work.

He had majored in English and social science and minored in journalism. He had a fine education and was making good progress on the Spokane paper when he heard of an opening on the Nashville Tennessean.

Ed liked the Tennessean and wanted to be a part of it. He was extremely happy when they hired him as a reporter. By 1943 Ed was the paper's city editor, working at night. He became day city editor 10 years ago and for the first time since he had been on the Tennessean he was at home nights.

The first of this year Ed Freeman became managing editor of the big and outstanding Tennessean and, incidentally, is back working at night.

The boy who fired furnaces and swept floors to get through Murray carried his dedication and determination in college into his

newspaper job, and for a long time has been a steady, dependable, and knowledgeable "old pro" at covering and having covered the local news that interests the Tennessean's readers.

Ed now supervises all editorial departments of the paper and handles the communications with the mechanical department.

Ed is married to the former Miss Lois Farley of Murray. They have a son, Mike, and a daughter, Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Reynolds.

Mike is doing what Ed hoped he would do—he is in the newspaper business. Mike is managing editor of a daily in Decatur, Ala. Mary Elizabeth lives with Ed and his wife at 4980 Stillwood Drive, Nashville.

Mike has two children and Mary Elizabeth has one.

Ed is the son of Mr. and Mrs. C. K. Freeman of the Calvert City-Palma area. Two sisters, Mrs. Oma Bell and Miss Ona Freeman (twins) live at Symsonia. Two brothers are Clarence L. Freeman, who works in one of the plants at Calvert City, and John, who is an electrician in Pana, Ill.

The NYA helped Ed but it helped my graduating class much more than it did him, because the program was better established and broader when I got there.

I went to Murray without a job but soon found one helping with the chores at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Calile Hale. Orville Owens, of Symsonia, who is in Evansville now, and Vincent Taylor, of Hardeman, near Mayfield, went to Murray together the first day of school. Orville had a basketball scholarship and Taylor had a little money.

All three of us wound up on NYA making all of our college expenses.

I don't believe any one of us would have been able to stay in school 6 months without the NYA.

Owens, incidentally, is part owner of a large grocery store in Evansville. His partner is Aubrey "Top" Ryals, who played on the same basketball team Orville and I played on in 1936-38 at Symsonia.

I lost touch with Taylor when he was in the old Army Air Corps during World War II.

In Memory of Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation grieves over the passing of the eminent Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter. Last week, Senator Dorsey Hardeman, of San Angelo, Tex., introduced Senate Resolution 176 in memory of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, and this resolution was unanimously passed and signed by our distinguished Lt. Gov. Preston Smith.

Senator Hardeman is one of our State's outstanding legislators and historians and has been recognized for his achievements in many fields. I am pleased to include a copy of this senate resolution, which is as follows:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 176: RESOLUTION IN MEMORY OF MR. JUSTICE FELIX FRANKFURTER

"(By Hardeman)

"Whereas the senate has learned with regret of the passing of Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter, retired former member of the Supreme Court of the United States; and

"Whereas having been born in Austria and having come to the United States at an early

age, he rose to the height of his chosen profession to become the 'Eloquent Dissenter' of the Nation's highest judicial tribunal and the 'needling conscience of the Court' with his 23 years of distinguished service as an Associate Justice thereof; and

"Whereas he was small of stature, but large of intellect and personal and judicial integrity who 'never sold the truth to serve the hour' nor violated, with impunity, his oath to support the Constitution and laws of the country he loved and served; and

"Whereas he sought to stay the heavy hand of arrogated authority so apparent in various decisions by the Court, such as in *Baker v. Carr*, 32 S. Ct. 691, wherein he charged that the equal protection and due process clauses of the 14th amendment—'have been invoked by Federal courts as restrictions upon the power of the States to allocate electoral weight among the voting population of their geographical divisions' which 'reverses a uniform course of decision established by a dozen cases' and, continuing, he decried the 'massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial power' stating that such 'demands a detailed analysis of the role of this (Supreme) Court in our constitutional scheme'; and

"Whereas his philosophy of government is expressed in the oft-quoted statement that 'The Constitution has ample means within itself to meet the changing needs of successive generations. * * * If the Court, aided by an alert and public-spirited bar, has access to the facts and follows them, the Constitution is flexible enough to meet all the new needs of our society'; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of Texas to pay its tribute of respect to the contributions of Judge Frankfurter in the preservation of constitutional law and his refusal to substitute political expediency for 'principles sanctioned by the wisdom and approved by the experience of the ages,' and to express its sympathy to his surviving wife: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the senate, That it hereby express its sympathy to Mrs. Frankfurter and its respect to the memory of Judge Frankfurter and that copies of this resolution, under the seal of the Senate of Texas, be forwarded to Mrs. Frankfurter; to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States; and to the dean of the Harvard Law School, by the secretary of the senate, and that this resolution be printed in the senate journal today.

"PRESTON SMITH,

"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate."

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on February 24, 1965, by a rising vote.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Our African Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1965

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have been granted permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Daily Dunklin Democrat of Kennett, Mo., written by Jack Stapleton, Jr., following the appearance in Kennett of James J. Blake, Deputy Director of the

law on the ground that control of teenage drinking was the responsibility of the home. Officials of Pennsylvania and Connecticut, where the drinking age is 21, have long urged New York to raise its drinking age. They have contended that their teenagers cross the State line and drink in New York, and sometimes, as a result, are victims of tragic automobile accidents on the way home.

Whether the Democrat-controlled legislature will sanction a drinking-age increase for the Governor's signature was a question. Assembly Speaker Anthony J. Travia, of Brooklyn, said he had not discussed such a measure with his Democratic colleagues. Senate Majority Leader Joseph Zaretzki, of Manhattan, noted that the measure was being studied by the legislative excise committees, but observed, "You can't stop drinking by a law."

Mr. Zaretzki suggested that "home influences" were the best measures against teenage drinking. Some form of local option that will give counties adjacent to neighboring States the power to regulate drinking age might be "a possibility," Mr. Zaretzki said.

Editorial Praising Senator Dodd's Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I recently have made several statements concerning my belief that the United States would be making a sad mistake to fail to live up to her commitments to the free, anti-Communist world and to South Vietnam by pulling out of that country at this time.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, has also voiced his views on this vital question and in doing so recently gave one of the best speeches yet delivered on the subject.

The Washington Star has taken note of Senator Dodd's speech. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Star.

The editorial follows:

DODD ON VIETNAM

One of the most impressive speeches to date on Vietnam has been delivered by Democratic Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut. It provides an interesting obligato to the swelling chorus of negotiation talk.

The Senator has not sugar-coated his words. He thinks some of his friends and colleagues, such as CHURCH, of Idaho, and McGOVERN, of South Dakota, are off their rockers when they call for negotiation now with the Communists. He has put forward a powerful argument against retreat at this time. And he has set forth a devastating, even alarming, assessment of the so-called militant Buddhists. With events to back him up, he has left little room for doubt that the leaders of these vaguely organized religionists serve the Communist cause.

In presenting this thesis, Senator DODD—a man distinguished for many things, including his role as a prosecutor of the Nazis at the Nuremberg trials—has put special emphasis on the fact that the free South Vietnamese are fervent fighters against the guerrillas of the Communist-led Vietcong. The statistics are striking and encouraging, despite Saigon's political instability. In the Senator's words, the South Vietnamese are one of the most anti-Communist people in the world. And they include over a million refugees who have fled from the Red north in a fighting spirit.

There are other statistics worth quoting. Some people have the idea, because of confusing headlines and rather shallow news stories, that the free Vietnamese are being clobbered by the Red guerrillas. Nothing could be further from the truth. Senator DODD has cited verifiable figures showing that the Communists, in terms of casualties, are still very much on the losing end of the struggle.

So there is much to be said for Senator DODD's basic thesis that the United States should yield no ground in Vietnam. Instead, and we agree, he advocates a tough line to make clear to Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow that they will be risking a war of incalculable consequences if they seriously try to drive us out of Asia and destroy what is left of freedom there.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

**REPRESENTATIVES WITH
RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON**

Office Address: House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbott, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, Wash.
Addabbo, Joseph P., N.Y.
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., Ill.
Anderson, William R., 3006 P St.
Tenn.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, Ala.-----
Andrews, Mark, N. Dak.-----
Annunzio, Frank, Ill.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., Ohio
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio
Ashmore, Robert T., S.C.
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----The Towers Apts.,
4201 Cathedral
Ave.
Ayres, William H., Ohio
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.
Bandstra, Bert, Iowa
Baring, Walter S., Nev.
Barrett, William A., Pa.
Bates, William H., Mass.
Battin, James F., Mont.
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.
Belcher, Page, Okla.
Bell, Alphonzo, Calif.
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1314 Rusticway
Lane,
Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio
Bingham, Jonathan B.,
N.Y.
Blatnik, John A., Minn.
Boggs, Hale, La.
Boland, Edward P., Mass.
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----307 Warrenton Dr.,
Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N.C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., Ohio.-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, Ind.
Bray, William G., Ind.
Brock, W. E. (Bill), Tenn.
Brooks, Jack, Tex.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio
Brown, George E., Jr., Calif.
Broyhill, James T., N.C.
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.
Buchanan, John, Ala.
Burke, James A., Mass.
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
El.
Burton, Laurence J., Utah
Burton, Phillip, Calif.
Byrne, James A., Pa.
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. S.,
Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, Tex.
Cahill, William T., N.J.
Callan, Clair, Nebr.
Callaway, Howard H., Ga.
Cameron, Ronald Brooks,
Calif.
Carey, Hugh L., N.Y.
Carter, Tim Lee, Ky.
Casey, Bob, Tex.
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.
Celler, Emanuel, N.Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.
Chelf, Frank, Ky.
Clancy, Donald D., Ohio
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., Calif.
Clawson, Del, Calif.
Cleveland, James C., N.H.

Clevenger, Raymond F.,
Mich.
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----1028 New House
Office Building
Collier, Harold R., Ill.
Colmer, William M., Miss.
Conable, Barber B., Jr.,
N.Y.
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----5619 Lamar Rd.,
Washington 16,
D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich.
Cooley, Harold D., N.C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.
Corman, James C., Calif.
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., Pa.
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., Iowa
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington,
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.
Dague, Paul B., Pa.
Daniels, Dominick V., N.J.
Davis, Glenn E., Wis.
Davis, John W., Ga.
Dawson, William L., Ill.
de la Garza, Eligio, Tex.
Delaney, James J., N.Y.
Dent, John H., Pa.
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio
Dickinson, William L., Ala.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.
Dingell, John D., Mich.
Dole, Robert, Kans.-----6815 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S.C.
Dow, John G., N.Y.
Dowdy, John, Tex.
Downing, Thomas N., Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N.Y.-----1719 New House
Office Building
Duncan, John J., Tenn.
Duncan, Robert B., Oreg.-----914 Lakeview Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N.J.
Dyal, Ken W., Calif.
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.
Edwards, Don, Calif.
Edwards, Jack, Ala.
Ellsworth, Robert F., Kans.
Erlenborn, John N., Ill.
Evans, Frank E., Colo.
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Kingle St.
Fallon, George H., Md.
Farbstein, Leonard, N.Y.
Farnsley, Charles P., Ky.
Farnum, Billie S., Mich.
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio
Findley, Paul, Ill.
Fino, Paul A., N.Y.
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.
Fogarty, John E., R.I.-----1255 New House
Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., Wash.
Ford, Gerald R., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Ford, William D., Mich.
Fountain, L. H., N.C.-----The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., Minn.
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., 3014 N St.
N.J.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.
Fulton, James G., Pa.
Fulton, Richard, Tenn.
Fuqua, Don, Fla.
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N.J.
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.
Gathings, E. C., Ark.
Gettys, Tom S., S.C.
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.
Gibbons, Sam, Fla.
Gilbert, Jacob H., N.Y.
Gilligan, John J., Ohio

Gonzalez, Henry B., Tex.-----200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., N.Y.-----3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F.,
Conn.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.
Green, William J., Pa.
Greigg, Stanley L., Iowa
Grider, George W., Tenn.
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.
Gross, H. R., Iowa
Grover, James R., Jr., N.Y.
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.
Gurney, Edward J., Fla.
Hagan, G. Elliott, Ga.
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.
Haley, James A., Fla.
Hall, Durward G., Mo.
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N.Y.
Hamilton, Lee H., Ind.
Hanley, James M., N.Y.
Hanna, Richard T., Calif.
Hansen, George, Idaho
Hansen, John R., Iowa.-----800 4th St. SW.,
Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler
(Mrs.), Wash.
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harscha, William H., Ohio
Harvey, James, Mich.
Harvey, Ralph, Ind.
Hathaway, William D.,
Maine.
Hawkins, Augustus F.,
Calif.
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio.-----1823 Barger Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.
Helstoski, Henry, N.J.
Henderson, David N., N.C.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.
Hicks, Floyd V., Wash.
Hollfield, Chet, Calif.
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.
Horton, Frank J., N.Y.
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.
Howard, James J., N.J.
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.
Hungate, William L., Mo.
Huot, J. Olive, N.H.
Hutchinson, Edward, Mich.
Ichor, Richard (Dick),
Mo.
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., Ind.
Jarman, John, Okla.
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.
Joelson, Charles S., N.J.
Johnson, Albert W., Pa.
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.
Johnson, Jed, Jr., Okla.
Jonas, Charles Raper, N.C.
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army-Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.
Karrh, Joseph E., Minn.
Kastenmeier, Robert W.,
Wis.
Kee, James, W. Va.-----5441 16th Ave.,
Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N.Y.
Keogh, Eugene J., N.Y.-----The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., N.Y.
King, Cecil R., Calif.
King, David S., Utah
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.
Kornegay, Horace R., N.C.
Krebs, Paul J., N.J.
Kunkel, John C., Pa.
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.
Langen, Odin, Minn.
Latta, Delbert L., Ohio
Leggett, Robert L., Calif.
Lennon, Alton, N.C.
Lindsay, John V., N.Y.
Lipscomb, Glenard P.,
Calif.