here said to me. "If you want to call this fight something else that is your privilege. But basically you are resisting the Chinese thrust for complete dominance of Asia, and I commend you for it. You are the only nation in the world with the guts and vigor to do it."

Both hawks and doves agree that China is one of the central issues of the war, and that the Vietcong versus Vietnamese Governments struggle is—relatively—a side issue. The hawks are pressing for a direct confrontation with China, some of them even hoping for an excluse to bomb out the Chinese nuclear facilities. The doves feel that no matter what we do, China in the year 2000 will clearly be the dominant power in Asia, as we are in the Western Hemisphere, and it is a waste of money and lives to fight such a useless fight.

The terrible thing is that both arguments are valid, and a choice between them is not simple. A direct challenge to the Chinese would not be a simple matter of bombing atomic facilities. One would have to send in a land army to fight across China, and as Mao Tse-tung has pointed out, it would be almost impossible for us to field an army large enough for victory. We are, after all, almost completely alone in our current Asian policy.

The assumption that China is interested only in consolidating its power in Asia assumes that a dedicated Communist revolutionary has a point at which he becomes sated. It is inconceivable that the Chinese will launch a fleet of junks across the Pacific to storm ashore at San Diego.

But the military strategists are also aware that in a few years the Chinese will have the missiles required to launch their atomic weapons, and when that day dawns, the United States will be faced with an adversary far more dangerous than Nikita Khrushchev ever was. There is no indication that the younger generation of Chinese Communists, whose character was not formed in the long, bloody civil war with Chiang Kai-shek, are less hard, or less Chinese than the aging guerrillas head by Mao Tse-tung.

"It took the Russians 40 years to face the responsibilities of their power," one American political officer said. "The Chinese are just starting to flex their muscles. It's like a street fight. The most dangerous kid on the block is usually the strong young kid who thinks he's unbeatable."

No one understands the Chinese thirst for expansion better than the Vietnamese, north and south. They fought the Chinese for almost 1,000 years. In his way, Ho Chi Minh has done an astute job of holding them back even now.

"Ho has played it very cagey," one Saigon political observer said. "He took all the help he needed from the Chinese during the fight against the French, and used China as a sanctuary. But he never allowed North Vietnam to become the kind of outright satellite that say, Rumania, was. The Vietcong are taking the weapons from China, and the political support. They know that most Asians fear China, and they make that fear work for them. But they also tell you that they will not have fought the Japanese, the French and the Americans for 30 years just to let the Chinese march in."

In some ways, the Vietcong in the south do not even trust Ho Chi Minh. On at least three separate occasions the north has sold out the southern revolution: in March 1946, when Ho made an agreement with the French that created a free state within the French Union, but left Cochin China (South Vietnam) under absolute French rule; in Geneva, in 1954, when Ho accepted the cutoff at the 17th parallel; and again in 1956 when North Vietnam made only feeble protests about the cancellation of the elections which were supposed to reunite the country.

"Everyone thinks the war can be solved if the United States just sits down with the North Vietnamese," one Saigon official said. "Suppose the Vietcong say to both 'get lost'? What happens then?"

The truth is that it is absurd to think of negotiating a solution to the war without making the Vietcong, and their political arm, the National Liberation Front, a party to the proceedings. They made the revolution—with the support of North Vietnam and China, to be sure—and they will have a say in how it ends.

Unfortunately, the best we can expect from a negotiated settlement is a coalition government, and there is little doubt that such a government would become Communist in a matter of a few years. With China breathing hard upon all of them, there is little hope for any nation in southeast Asia to be truly independent. They might be sovereign, but no more independent than, say, Guatemala. And our own chances at trying to transform Ho Chi Minh into a kind of southeast Asian Tito withered in the cold war, and the missionary evangelism of John Foster Dulles. The history of our involvement in Vietnam, like that of China and Cuba, is a history of lost chances.

So the hard choices in Vietnam are staring us in the face. We can negotiate a settlement, if the other side agrees finally to talk, and be prepared eventually to lose South Vietnam to a Communist government. We can save face doing this by agreeing to phase out our troops over a 3-year period while the coalition government tries to govern the country. As a nation, we can then pull back to a more sensible commitment in the world. We can concentrate on South America, on our own domestic running sores like slums and poverty. We can give up the role of playing policemen to the world.

But if we do that we must recognize it as a kind of victory for China. The Chinese themselves are making this war into a war of Asians against white men. We must be very clear on that if we decide to negotiate. China is holding up the Vietnamese example to the rest of the world. One more decade of incompetent, hopeless rule, and India could go to the Communists. If Africa continues on its erratic path, the Communists could take most of it. The one thing communism does offer, after all, is stability. It is the stability of the graveyard, but if you are searching for peace and quiet, Albania is the place to go.

Those who have studied the situation do not believe much in the domino theory, but they do feel that the Chinese Communists see the world power struggle as an extension of guerrilla warfare. In guerrilla warfare you isolate the enemy in the cities by taking over the countryside. By extension, the continental United States becomes the city, the underdeveloped world the countryside. In those terms the Chinese threat, especially when it achieves the means of delivering atomic weapons, is a real one.

So the second choice is to fight. If we decide the fight is worthwhile and that we can contain Chinese expanionism by making that fight in South Vietnam, then we must immediately make the terms of the fight clear. We must stop the pious rhetoric and the murky generalities. We must tell the people of this country that young men will die in the next 5 or 6 years as they have never died before. One military man in Saigon told me that we must be prepared to take 300,000 casualties, and possibly more. We can hope that in the interim Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung will die; the Vietcong cause will lose popularity with the death of Ho; and the Chinese might become more tractable without Mao.

Every military man I spoke to is agreed that the war will be bloody and long. The popularity-of-the-war polls are running in favor of keeping the war going. But most experts suspect that this is only because the war and its bloody possibilities have never been fully explained.

The various plans for solving the war, including the so-called Gavin plan, are all based on an American pullout. One can sit in enclaves and leave the rest of South Vietnam to the Vietcong until a peace of sorts can be negotiated. Other plans call for fighting until the rebellion is crushed, as was done in Malaya, the Philippines, and Greece. Each is based on the belief that there are simple solutions to complex problems.

As a reporter, I discovered in South Vietnam that the world is never as simple as it seems when sitting at a typewriter in New York. I don't like young men dying. I don't like the idea that my country is fighting to keep a corrupt, selfish, feudal society in power in a country whose citizens demand revolution. I wish for once we had joined a revolution instead of fighting against it.

But I would hate to have to explain to young men in 1980 that the reason we are about to engage the Chinese in a contest to destroy the world with nuclear arms was because we walked away from a fight in 1966. I do wish the cant and the lying would be removed from the discussion and that we would be told some concrete truths about the war. Perhaps if our Government would do that we could all decide clearly what we think should be done. I don't really know. I do know that as you read this young men are dying.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before the present Congress is adjourned, we will be called upon to consider and act on a number of pieces of legislation affecting labor and industry. Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a copy of a letter written by a small independent businessman. Names and figures have been deleted, but the thoughts in the letter are worthwhile in light of the pending legislation:

JANUARY 14, 1966.

I have just returned from New York, where, for a period of 10 days, I was forced to experience the inconvenience and discomfort in connection with what was probably the costliest and most unnecessary strike in the history of the city of New York. If there had not already been a critical need for such a letter as this, going through the subway strike would certainly have provoked one.

First of all, may I express my appreciation for the fact that you are our Congressman at large, and I find myself seldom if ever in disagreement with the stand you have taken on legislation.

We are now in a new session of Congress, and if one would be influenced by President Johnson's message to Congress, it would seem that a considerable portion of the legislation under consideration will be of a character, which, if enacted, would have a devastating effect on smaller towns and smaller retailers, so disastrous, in fact that there is

Women's Division, Miami Chamber of Commerce.

The club sponsored a 13-week traffic safety program on Channel 2 in 1958 and Edna Van Acker that year became Southeastern Regional Chairman of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

She previously had headed district 10 and the Florida Federation, which she also had served as scholarship chairman and membership chairman. In her latter role she assisted in organizing 25 clubs in Florida, with a membership of more than 1,000 women.

A BIRTHDAY HONOR: THE LEADING WOMEN OF MIAMI BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB

Business and professional women's club leaders have been heralded throughout the last half century in this community ever since the Miami BPW Club was organized February 2, 1916.

Miami Club will honor several of theirs at its 50th birthday party Saturday at Everglades Hotel including their first president, Marjory Stoneman Douglas, who has written many books that have brought her fame since that day when she took office.

Mrs. Douglas, a former newspaperwoman, is author of "The Everglades, River of Grass," "Road to the Sun," "Freedom River" and "Hurricane" as well as many magazine stories.

When the club's current leader, Florence McMahon (Mrs. Richard T.) Yoder left Detroit for Miami in 1956 she went back to college. Two years later she graduated with honors from the University of Miami, a bachelor of business administration.

Mrs. Yoder began her business career running a sewer cleaning business. Today she is external auditor for the Dade County Port Authority at Miami International Airport, employed by Morgan Altemus & Barrs, CPA firm.

She is a member of Alpha Lambda Delta, Beta Sigma Phi, and Phi Kappa Phi. Upon graduation from the university she received an award from the Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants. In September 1965 "Mac" married Richard Yoder of the Finance Office, Urban Renewal Project in Dade County.

One of the Miami club's past presidents, Mrs. Clara Caspar, will come all the way from Junction City, Kans., to attend the 50th birthday candlelight dinner. She served her club in 1941–42 and was the first of its World War II leaders. She saw her membership making quick response to wartime volunteer service.

With other past presidents Mrs. Caspar will be introduced during Saturday's celebration by another past president, Lila Mae (Mrs. Samuel L.) Durgan.

Lila Mae rose to be president of the Florida Federation of BPW Clubs in 1958. She was first State governor of Florida Opti-Mrs. Clubs; was chairman of the Poinciana Festival in the city of Miami in 1961. In 1962 she served as president of the United Church Women of Greater Miami.

It was during her administration of Miami BPW that she inaugurated the Club Chatter, a bulletin.

Traffic safety has long been a must in the lives of the Miami BPW Club members. Among past presidents who backed it with fervor is Irene Redstone, attorney, who served as prexy in 1946–47.

She inaugurated a traffic sticker program that employed the slogan "Safety Through Courtesy."

Miss Redstone is assistant staff counsel for the Florida Bar Association in charge of its grievance committee office. She specializes in child custody matters.

Her membership in Miami BPW was interrupted during World War II by 3 years in the Navy as Yeoman 1st Class. It was after the war that she studied law at the University of Miami and earned her degree.

She serves the American Bar Association's Council on the section of family law.

When Miamian Valley K. Bennett's husband Robert, died in Tifton, Ga., in 1917, she became president of Bennett's Hardware, Inc., dealers in hardware, paints, varnishes, and farm implements.

Mrs. Bennett learned "Ignorance is bliss. It stood me in good hand during many an incidental need for knowledge."

She started learning the business including how to assemble plows, mowing machines, milk separators, cultivators, much to the amazement of my customers.

In Tifton in 1918 she helped organize and became president of the Tifton Business and Professional Women's Club. Then came an exodus of many Georgians to Florida, among them Mrs. Bennett.

Through the first vice president of the First National Bank of Miami, Mildred Romfh, Mrs. Bennett became manager of the savings department of the bank. Miss Romfh was a past president of the Miami BPW Club, which Mrs. Bennett had joined. Valley herself became president in 1933.

Before her retirement in 1953 Mrs. Bennett had been an accountant for a factory representative of food products and allied lines. During World War II she was chairman of the business and professional women's division of the Dade County War Finance Committee for the U.S. Treasury.

She also is an active member of the Miami Soroptimist Club and the Miami Bookfellows.

While Judge Mattie Belle Davis was president of the Miami BPW Club (1952–54) Dade County women became incensed by the lack of enforcement of the 1951 meat inspection law in Florida.

Her Miami club joined other clubs in showing their disapproval. The result was favorable action by the State Livestock Board.

Judge Davis is the first Floridian to serve as president of the National Association of Women Lawyers and the only woman to sit on the bench of the Dade County Metropolitan Court.

She began her legal career as a secretary in the office of the late Troy Davis, whom she later married. With him she practiced law after passing her bar examinations in 1936.

Georgia-born Judge Davis was appointed as judge of the Metropolitan Court of Dade County by the board of commissioners in 1959 and reappointed in July 1964. She was a member of the American Bar Association's associate and advisory committee to the standing committee on the traffic court program.

She is active in Zonta Club of Greater Miami and is on the international safety committee of Zonta International. For 2 years she was president of the Haven School for Mentally Retarded Children; then its secretary. For 2 years she headed the Dade TB Association. She has served 8 years as legislation chairmen for the Dade County Federation of Women's Clubs.

NBC Honors Chicago's Len O'Connor on His 25th Year of Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last night the National Broadcasting Co. honored one of Chicago's most highly respected journalists, Len O'Connor, who is observing his 25th year of reporting.

Len O'Connor is one of Chicago's most popular television journalists and commentators. NBC is to be congratulated for honoring him on his 25th anniversary.

He is frequently called the "Guardian of Chicago's Conscience." Because of his thorough understanding of the problems of a large city like Chicago; his deep insight into problems of America and his thorough knowledge of international affairs, he today has several million people in the Midwest following his daily commentary both on radio and television.

Len O'Connor is a newspaperman's journalist. He is penetrating, perceptive, understanding and often pungent, but never unfair. He has earned the respect not only of those he reports about, but also those he reports for.

Mr. Speaker it was a privilege to be invited yesterday to see the top management people from the National Broadcasting Co.'s Midwest facilities present Len O'Connor with a wrist watch in grateful recognition of his 25 years of outstanding journalism.

May time be kind to him so he can observe his golden jubilee of enterprising and dedicated contributions to the highest standards of American journalism.

Hope and Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, America is at its greatest when it accents the positive, and this we are able to do when we fight "wars" on poverty and disease and thus lift up the spirits of mankind.

This is the step we are taking now in Vietnam—a positive step, reflected by the fact that the President took the Secretaries of Welfare and Agriculture to the Honolulu meeting.

The New-York Herald-Tribune said:

It is in their fields that the United States can well take the offensive, against disease and poverty, and thus strengthen the defense of South Vietnam at vital points. For this is the positive side of the ugly war, the hope and the promise.

And it is this that gives a particular moral content to the whole united effort to bring peace to a free South Vietnam.

I found the editorial to be most enlightening, and I therefore recommend that it be printed in the RECORD, where others also may read it.

COUNCIL IN THE PACIFIC

It is reasonable to suppose that the primary intent of President Johnson's journey to Hawaii to meet with the Americans and South Vietnamese concerned with the struggle in Vietnam is to discuss the prosecution of the war. Meanwhile, in the wake of the Security Council's decision to take up the Vietnam question, U.N. members have been stepping up activities intended to end the

war. Yet the two efforts are not contradictory.

American aims in Vietnam are essentially defensive. They are to prevent the forcible absorption of South Vietnam by the north. Diplomatic efforts to end the war must take into account the stark fact that the goal of the North Vietnam Government and the Vietcong is to swallow up the south; neither has ever deviated in public statements from that goal. Naturally, the Communists would prefer to accomplish this without further fighting; naturally, they would accept surrender by the south. But since this is completely at odds with the American commitment, the diplomatic purpose must be to demonstrate that conquest is impossible. And unless this is credible, from events in the field, diplomacy will fail—again.

Whether Mr. Johnson's Pacific conference portends dramatic new developments, or merely the intensification of present military efforts, remains to be seen. But one interesting feature of the conference will be the presence—emphasized by President Johnson—of the Secretaries of Welfare and Agriculture. It is in their fields that the United States can well take the offensive, against disease and poverty, and thus strengthen the defense of South Vietnam at vital points. For this is the positive side of the ugly war, the hope and the promise. And it is this that gives a particular moral content to the whole united effort to bring peace to a free South Vietnam.

Failure To Remove Snow at District of Columbia Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I commented on the failure of the District of Columbia to deal effectively with the snow situation which paralyzed the city. Since then I have had many reports and examples of dangerous situations which were permitted to exist. For instance, I am told that a week after the snow fell, along the school grounds at 13th Street NW., at Military Road, little tots still had to choose whether to defy the deady rush-hour traffic on 13th Street or brave the chin-deep snow, still untrampled on the school walk.

In front of Wilson High School on Nebraska Avenue, the snow, higher than a tall man stands, remained untouched for days after the children returned to school. The report which came to me indicated that similar conditions were found at most other District of Columbia schools. It seems that the only thing brought to bear on the snow surrounding our public schools here were the cold, damp feet of courageous children beating a path to classes that were declared reopened, with a dare to get there if you can.

In times of such emergency, why cannot we recruit from among the ranks of those men who are drawing upon the various Federal sustaining programs, at least to perform the public service of clearing a path to our school buildings—before we order the children to return? Perhaps the Job Corps could help in such instances—or those who, under better weather circumstances, would be working on the beautification program.

Wheelchair Folk Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert two colums by one of Cleveland's most talented and interesting columnists, Winsor French, in the Cleveland Press. He points out from firsthand knowledge a situation confronting handicapped persons which certainly deserves the attention of the Congress in respect to Federal buildings.

WHEELCHAIR FOLK IGNORED

Every now and again I hear from a reader who, as I, must rely on a wheelchair and wants to know if I can tell her how one manages to get into certain buildings, if, indeed, it is possible at all. The last time I heard from her, her interest was in Public Hall where she had hoped to see the trailer show. This she was unable to do, persevere though she did.

Well, the auditorium, as so many of our public buildings, is the product of inept architecture. Even getting into the new multimillion-dollar wing is an impossibility for the chairborne.

The hall does have ramps but how to find them is a Chinese puzzle and no one is very cooperative.

In fact, after several futile attempts and it was a snowy, blustery, bitter night, my friend was asked by a guard why she had even bothered to make the effort. In other words, if you are handicapped and present a problem, then stay home. Anyway, that did it. The disappointed lady and her quite rightly outraged husband drove away.

I suggested the next time she contemplated such an adventure that she call Paul Hurd, who manages the building, and leave it up to him. He must at least know where the ramps are.

But Public Hall is not the only offender. It would be easier to climb the pyramids than make it into the Federal Building on Public Square.

In fact, anyone in a chair must arrange to have the freight elevator brought up through the sidewalk, which is precisely what I did when I had to get a new passport not too long ago. Actually, I rather enjoyed it, but it was summer and the weather was fine.

The public library? I gave that up long ago. I went to the practically brand new art institute last week, however, eager to see the faculty show.

Well, it is a splendid exhibition, small and beautifully hung but the effort spent getting inside the building was exhausting and I will think twice before attempting it again.

It seems simply incredible that our great public buildings and museums shouldn't at least provide the people with narrow wooden ramps flanking the stairs. They would be very inexpensive to install and make life much easier for the multitudes of the handicapped. And even getting into the Press Building is no cinch unless you know the ropes.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been bringing to the attention of my colleagues a series of articles written from Vietnam for the New York Post by Correspondent Pete Hamill. I include at this point the third article in the series:

VIETNAM: THE ENDLESS WAR—ARTICLE III: OUR ALLIES

(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—The one thing everyone was agreed upon when Nguyen Cao Ky took over as Premier of South Vietnam last year was that he had color. There was no question about it: At 34, he was young, handsome and dashing, with all the swaggering style of the Japanese movie star Toshiro Mifune.

As head of the country's air force, he led his squadron into battle in a tailormade black silk flying suit and lavender scarf, with a chrome-plated, pearl-handled revolver slung low on his hip. To celebrate his divorce from his wife—a Frenchwoman who bore him five children—and his remarriage to a pretty Air Vietnam stewardess, he led his squadron of 20 Skyraiders on a low sweep over Saigon to a bombing run on an empty clump of jungle not far from the capital. Embarrassed Vietnamese military spokesmen later said the area was a Vietcong stronghold, and the air strike had been a success. Ky's flying buddies toasted him that night with champagne, then moved to the backyard to empty their revolvers at tin cans. There were no casualties.

Away from the hazards of war, Ky acquired a garish reputation as a Tu Do Street hipster. He and his flyboy buddies would spend the evenings in restaurants like Brodard's, nursing brandy and coffee, listening to the melancholy songs of Edith Piaf on the jukebox, discussing endlessly the merits of their women. At parties, he would compose love poems on the spot, and recite them to the loveliest woman in the room, his voice choked, his eyes brimming with tears. When such pursuits wearied him, he turned for solace to his gamecocks, which he raised on the side.

Today, his intimates say, Ky is a changed man. The burdens of office lie heavily upon him. The girls don't see him around Brodard's any more, his literary talent is exercised on official documents and speeches, and even when he visits a battleground he brings his wife along. He hasn't done anything swashbuckling in months. Except, perhaps, to survive.

In the can of worms which is Saigon politics, to survive as long as Ky has is a very real accomplishment. When he took the job last June, as the front man for a 10-man military junta, he became the head of the ninth government in South Vietnam since the murder of Ngo Dinh Diem in November 1963.

One of the major reasons for Ky's survival is his realistic attitude toward the job. "The generals have picked me more to risk my life than as an honor," he said when he took the post last June. "I have told my wife to buy me a coffin."

One cannot blame him. Saigon today is a sinkhole of corruption, indifference, and greed. As the American millions are poured in, the number of hands reaching eagerly into the till are proliferating. On the Saigon waterfront, a shipping owner can get his ship unloaded out of turn by paying $500. At police checkpoints, Communist agents carry-

ing contraband medical equipment into the countryside get by with a small bribe. The stalls in the black market are choked with American soaps, hair sprays, cigarettes, candy, shoe polish and even C-rations, most of it booty from pilfered PX deliveries.

The wives of prominent Chinese merchants smuggle diamonds out of the country every week, because gold is too bulky, and the paper currency is about as stable as the government which prints it. In the Indian bookshops on Tu Do Street, where you can still pick up dusty copies of such classics as "Dave Dawson in Libya," the rate is now up to 170 piasters to the dollar; the official rate is 73 to the dollar.

The rice merchants plead that the Vietcong have cut off their deliveries, and then, when the price has been sufficiently jacked up, they produce large quantities of it. The wife of at least one Vietnamese general, according to reliable sources, takes a monthly cut from a string of brothels. And the liveliest arguments among the members of the junta are not over methods of beating the Vietcong, but over who will control the customs, the port of Saigon and the communications systems.

When Ky first took office, he announced with loud fanfare that his major task would be the elimination of graft and black marketeering. (Has any military junta in history promised anything different?) He summoned the top 28 rice merchants in Saigon and told them that if prices were not lowered, one of them would be selected by lot and shot. The prices went down, at least for a while.

Ky also promised to reform the draft system. And it is true that in Saigon you can watch the police round up young men coming out of movie theaters every afternoon. But it is still possible to pick up a forged draft card for about $10, and for $250 a young man can obtain an exit visa and study medieval scholasticism at the Sorbonne in Paris for the duration. Meanwhile, in rural areas, the army—like the Vietcong—employs a system which differs from kidnaping only to the extent that no ransom is asked.

Aside from the usual tributes to freedom and a kind of glib anticommunism, no one really knows where Ky and the junta stand politically. Last month, in a Vietnamese equivalent of a state of the union message, Ky promised a new constitution for the country by October, and free elections to be held next year. Most old Saigon hands doubted that he would be around to vote in them.

Many officials in the American mission here—civilian and military—shudder at the prospect of Ky's having a free hand. They realize that this war is as much a political problem as a military one, and that the political solutions will take years of hard, frustrating, grueling work.

The Vietnamese have also become quite touchy about what they feel is a growing American takeover of the war. Ky has made some statements asserting his independence, viewing that the war would never be solved without the consent of the Saigon government. But the hard fact is that we have committed billions of dollars to the war, and more than 200,000 troops, and we should have a major say in the solution.

"The Vietnamese want it both ways," one American political officer in Saigon told me. "They want our money, our guns and our men to die for them. But they don't want us to negotiate a settlement. Goddammit, the hard truth is that this has become our war and we should settle it our way without worrying about wounded feelings."

The man with the responsibility of maintaining some equilibrium between the American leaders and the Vietnamese is Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. Somewhere there must be a man with the adrenalin, ideas and style to handle this delicate, taxing job. Many here feel that Henry Cabot Lodge is not that man.

For practical political purposes Lodge could just as well be serving as the Ambassador to Patagonia. He was here as Ambassador once before, for seven months beginning in June of 1963, and performed creditably at that time. Arriving during the Buddhist crisis which eventually toppled the Diem regime, he had nowhere to move but up—everything having gone wrong under the tenure of the previous Ambassador, Frederick Nolting. Lodge worked relatively hard, and used his past experience as a professional politician to some advantage in defusing the anti-American sentiment caused by the Buddhist-Catholic argument.

Since replacing the icy Maxwell Taylor, however, it has become more and more evident that Lodge's prime qualification is that he is a Republican, and that he photographs well. The men who work under him say that he just does not seem interested in the job any more. They say he prefers swimming at the Cercle Sportif to the back-breaking homework that such a job requires.

"Cabot Lodge always had a lazy mind," one member of the American civilian establishment told me. "But there were times when he could rise to an occasion, as he did against the Russians in the U.N., as he did during his first tour here. But he doesn't care any more and I think I know why. He has stopped running for office."

Some observers say that the main problem with Lodge is his image; in a revolutionary situation the most important American in the country should not look like a representative of the landed gentry. "Hell, we'd be better off with some tough old roll-up-the-sleeve radical like Saul Alinsky," an officer in the AID program said. "That kind of guy would go out and pull rice with the peasants, drive bulldozers in the country, look like he understood what the roots of the war are all about."

Such criticism is harsh and, in some ways, unfair. Lodge gets along well with Ky, and is an improvement over Taylor in matters of tact. Many of the Vietnamese generals could not forgive Taylor for what they thought was his haughty, disdainful manner. The story is told that after one of the coups that plagued his year as Ambassador, Taylor summoned the generals to dinner at a restaurant, asked them if they understood English, dressed them down for pulling the coup, then told them he had wasted his money even buying them dinner. Lodge would never consider doing such a thing.

Meanwhile, Ky continues to walk the tightrope. His meeting in Honolulu should shore up his prestige and perhaps he can continue as Premier for a few more years. He has already lasted longer than anyone expected.

But if he survives, Ky will have to do more for his country than ask for more bombing, more American troops and more money. He has to become a leader of his people. And he will never do that sitting in an office in Saigon.

The Elkhart, Ind., Truth Endorses 4-Year Term for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the text of an editorial published on January 27, 1966, by the Elkhart, Ind., Truth endorsing a constitutional amendment providing 4-year terms for Members of Congress and expressing support as well for staggering the terms.

The editorial follows:

FOUR-YEAR TERMS, BUT WITH PROVISO

While we favor extending the terms of U.S. Representatives from 2 to 4 years, as proposed by President Johnson, we don't believe they should all be elected in the presidential election years.

To do that would greatly increase the power of the presidency, and thereby upset checks and balances as between the branches of the Government.

This would encourage the candidacy of "coattail riders," seeking to reach legislative office through the casting of straight tickets for a personally popular President or other presidential candidate.

Besides, it is important that people have recourse during an "off-year" election to the choice of some new Representatives in case they don't like what has happened in the 2 years past.

This could be taken care of easily by "staggering" the terms, for example by electing half of the House of Representatives in the presidential year and half in the off-year.

Yes, the 4-year term for House Members would be good. It would allow new Members more time to learn the ropes; it would require current Members to spend less time on campaigning for reelection, thus they could devote more time to the people's business.

But in drawing up the proposed constitutional amendment to accomplish this, let's apply the modification as to method of election we have indicated.

Tribute to William C. Burnham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper in my congressional district, namely, the Neighborhood Journal of Oakland, Calif., has a correspondent, Mrs. Elena Moneak Snite, who runs a continuous column entitled "Personality Profiles."

Mrs. Snite is a lady of great perspicacity who tends to focus on individuals whose daily endeavors contribute so much to our everyday life but who largely remain anonymous.

On January 26 her column was devoted to highlighting the work of Mr. William C. Burnham, who is superintendent of the Dimond branch of the U.S. Post Office in Oakland, Calif. I think that Mrs. Snite's column is a fitting tribute to Mr. Burnham and the hundreds of other loyal post office employees who do so much each day for those of us who depend on this important line of communication.

I am pleased to insert Mrs. Snite's column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PERSONALITY PROFILES

(By Elena Moneak Snite)

In approaching my personality profile for this week, Mr. Wm. C. Burnham, who is the very capable and alert superintendent of the Dimond branch of our Government Post Office, I immediately had the impression that here was a gentleman that demonstrated the fact that no man can prosper until he applies as much dignity to any labor he may

perform as he would if he were writing a poem.

"Mrs. Snite, I feel blessed that I have found the work that I love to do."

"I was born in Connecticut and graduated from the high school there in the midst of the depression. My family at that time decided to come to California and after trying several jobs in California I knew that I wished to work for our Government. I then took and passed the required Civil Service examination which fortified me with the general knowledge pertaining to postal work and I have been in postal service since 1941. I was transferred from the main post office in Oakland to the Dimond branch where I have been since 1954. At this branch we handle about 10,000 pieces of mail a day—we have 26 carriers—4 clerks—and an assistant superintendent.

"I have learned that men seldom die of hard work and that activity is God's medicine. The greatest source of fulfillment is willingness and ability to do hard work. It's interesting work that rids us of three great evils; irksomeness—vice—and poverty. I know of no secret of success but hard work."

"Each day I am grateful for my many blessings. I have a good wife which we all know is heaven's best gift to man. We are so proud of our daughter Linda and her husband Jim and of course little Kandy Ann who is 3 years old and Patricia Marie just 4 months old. Our son William Gary is already busy chiseling his own niche in life and is at present employed with Todd Ship Building in Alameda."

"No man properly occupied is ever miserable. My wife is kept busy taking care of our home, our beautiful garden and many other services that demand all of her time. And I spend whatever extra time I have in the activities of the National Association of Postal Supervisors and the Independent Rifles Club of San Francisco."

Thank you Mr. Burnham for your time and the oppotrunity for your Dimond Clients to become better acquainted with you. You have proven the axiom that they that govern most make the least noise. In rowing a barge they that do drudgery work slash, puff and sweat: but he that governs, sits quietly at the stern and scarcely is seen to stir.

Mr. Michael Monroney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to join the Postmaster General, Lawrence O'Brien, in expressing my deep regret over the resignation of his Executive Assistant, Mr. Michael Monroney.

I am sure that I speak for my colleagues in saying that Mike Monroney's vast experience in Government affairs will be missed. He has made great contributions to the Post Office Department which will long be remembered by the citizens of the Nation.

Mike has served his country well under President Kennedy and President Johnson. Mike Monroney began his present assignment in early 1961 under former Postmaster General J. Edward Day, assisting him during the transition of the Post Office Department to the Kennedy administration.

Monroney brought to his postal job considerable and varied experience in journalism and in local and Federal Government affairs.

Moving into nearby Silver Spring, Md., following his graduation from Dartmouth College in 1951, he covered suburban affairs as a staff reporter for the Washington, D.C., Post and Times-Herald during most of his 5 years with the newspaper.

In 1957 and 1958, he served as a top aide to the county manager of Montgomery County, Md., adjacent to the District of Columbia. In 1956 he served on the presidential campaign staff of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson.

The 38-year-old Monroney served for 2 years as administrative assistant to Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, during which he worked on a variety of legislative problems, including aid to distressed areas, Federal aid to education, the Federal airport construction program and labor-management reform legislation.

He left Congressman BRADEMAS' staff in January of 1961 to assume his present position. As executive assistant to the Postmaster General, Monroney is in charge of congressional liaison for the Post Office Deparment in addition to other assignments at the direction of the Postmaster General.

Named Maryland Young Democrat of the Year in 1961, Monroney was also nominated that same year for one of the 10 outstanding young men of the year awards sponsored annually by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce.

A Navy veteran, he is the son of U.S. Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.

I would like to wish him the best of success in whatever field of endeavor he chooses to enter. Past experience shows that Mike is a man who has a deep understanding and sympathy for his fellowman and is dedicated to serving his country.

Space Experts Must Soon Decide Question: Where After the Moon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Karl Abraham in his article in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of January 17 discusses the question of what programs NASA will undertake after the lunar landing. In his article Mr. Abraham points out that the Saturn V launch vehicle will soon be available with its tremendous payload capability and discusses manned as well as unmanned use of this large vehicle. He also clearly points out the need to reach an early decision so that our current space program will have sufficient time to allow for gradual changeover of the current work underway to the newer objectives that will follow our initial lunar landing.

The article follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Jan. 17, 1966]

SPACE EXPERTS MUST SOON DECIDE QUESTION: WHERE AFTER THE MOON?

(By Karl Abraham)

The men who run the Nation's space program, although they are not yet sure of successfully landing men on the moon, must decide soon what to do after the first lunar landings are made.

The alternatives are extensive explorations of the moon for a decade or a shift of emphasis toward planetary missions. Both are to be reckoned in the tens of billions of dollars.

For President Johnson, who omitted mention of the space program's future from his state of the Union message last week, it is largely a financial question to be weighed against his hopes for the Great Society and conclusion of the Vietnam war.

CRITICAL DECISION

But the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, its space centers, the industries, universities, and the Nation's scientific and engineering communities face a related critical decision within the space program itself.

The decision confronts them now—possibly somewhat earlier in the drive toward the moon than many had anticipated—largely because of a single technological development: the impending arrival, finally, of big, powerful rockets.

The moon rocket, the advanced Saturn, sometimes called the Saturn 5, with its 7.5-million-pound thrust booster and two upper stages, giving it a total power of 8.7 million pounds thrust, will be a mighty workhorse.

NEW POSSIBILITIES OPEN

With other upper stages, such as the new hydrogen-fueled Centaur, all kinds of new possibilities open up in space exploration.

The Saturn 5's primary mission is to send a 95,000-pound Apollo three-man moonship to the moon, including the lunar landing craft and enough rocket power for the trip back from the moon.

But it is capable of other missions also. It can lift 250,000 pounds—125 tons—into a 500-mile-high earth orbit; carry 50 tons away from earth; 45 tons toward Mars or Venus; 20 tons to the giant planet Jupiter; and with a Centaur upper stage, it could even carry a probe weighing 7.5 tons clear out of the solar system.

WHERE NEXT

Saturn 5 will make possible the assembly, in Earth orbit, or other larger rockets—sent up a stage at a time, the fuel separately. A complete Saturn 5 could be assembled in space for all kinds of missions.

It is this impending prospect and the knowledge that many years of engineering and design of payloads will be needed to take advantage of Saturn 5 for these advanced missions that makes a decision on "where after the Moon?" such an urgent one.

The decision is by no means only a scientific or technical one.

The attitude of James E. Webb, NASA's Administrator—very much reflecting President Johnson's also—is tied up in a question he has posed to many of his workers and consultants.

BENEFITS QUESTIONED

"How can the space program most substantially benefit the American people? How can space exploration and what we learn from it help us on Earth," he asks over and over.

One segment of the Nation's scientific community, while mindful of these considerations, poses the question of the future in different terms.

Saturday's report by a space science board panel, which urged higher priorities for exploring the planets, put it this way:

City's War on Poverty Runs Well but Has Its Troubles in Job Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a reporter, Margaret Josten, of the Cincinnati Enquirer, has written a seven-part series on the antipoverty program in Cincinnati. Today, I include the last part of her series to illustrate the kind of reporting that helps inform the public about the various antipoverty programs at work in our communities under the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

CITY'S WAR ON POVERTY RUNS WELL, BUT HAS ITS TROUBLES IN JOB FIELD

(By Margaret Josten)

While the antipoverty war at the Federal level is beset by a never-ending stream of financial and political troubles, Cincinnati's effort seems to be running on fairly well-oiled wheels.

Theodore M. Berry, former Cincinnati vice mayor, now a top official in the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, is gratified, in fact, to see his home city doing its job with what he calls "a minimum of the kind of tension and conflict general in other communities."

He rates Cincinnati's effort as better than average, adding, "I think it ranks very well in the upper 10th of the class."

Cincinnati does have some problems, however. And while they may not be of importance in the big picture, some do get to the very key to the success of the antipoverty war. They have to do with jobs and job training.

A dispute has developed here in recent weeks between the Community Action Commission, local arm of the war, and the Ohio Bureau of Unemployment Compensation, charged by law with setting up job-training programs under the Manpower Development Training Act.

John E. Hansan, CAC executive director, charges that the BUC has failed to show aggressive action in getting such programs into operation.

Lewis H. Evans, BUC area manager, answers that he cannot set up job-training classes until he determines whether jobs will be available for the graduates.

"We can do not greater injustice to an individual than to put him into training and then have no job for him," adds Mr. Evans.

Mr. Hansan's argument is that MDTA requirements in connection with occupational demand can be adhered to "liberally or rigidly." He thinks Mr. Evans is being too rigid.

Another argument which goes 'round and 'round in Cincinnati has to do with union membership for Negroes, who, by their very position on the economic ladder, are most involved in the war against poverty.

Civil rights groups charge that the building trades unions give only token membership to Negroes. The unions say otherwise. Efforts to straighten out the matter locally have had little effect.

This argument goes on nationally, too.

Top OEO officials avoid taking one side or another. One does say, however, that a large union (presumably in the building trades) is getting ready to set up an apprenticeship program which would alleviate much of the trouble.

A number of job-training programs are underway in Cincinnati. The board of education, the Citizens Committee on Youth, and the BUC are prominent among the sponsors.

Mr. Evans reports that an average of 400 persons a month have been in training under the Manpower Development Training Act during 1965. This does not include on-the-job programs in which 113 persons are training in 17 categories at private local firms.

Occupations for which people train under MDTA range from automobile repairing to welding, from tool and die making to cooking.

A major problem in the local antipoverty effort lies in that area known as Over the Rhine, where, although help is sorely needed, there is as yet no program funded by OEO.

Over the Rhine, which Mr. Hansan calls one of the most difficult neighborhoods in Cincinnati, is a heterogeneous mixture of young and old, white and Negro, old established families and migrants. The topography is so fragmented it really is not a single neighborhood.

Mr. Hansan explains that the area has a proliferation of social agencies and religious institutions, each with its own way of doing things, but none with the staff or budget to do the big job.

In addition, he says, southern Appalachian migrants, of whom there are many in Over the Rhine, are neither joiners nor belongers. This makes any kind of neighborhood attack on poverty difficult, he adds.

But Mr. Hansan is optimistic. He hopes that "sometime before spring" enough leadership will have been pulled together from among the residents and the institutions to make some definite antipoverty plans.

The word from Washington is such, however, that the financial outlook for new programs is bad.

Several national programs will need to be cut back. And the community action division of the OEO, now headed by Mr. Berry, is not going to be free with its money in the future.

The war in Vietnam has top priority.

VN

Youngsters Favoring U.S. Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride I learned of the action of students of the Big Spring High School, Big Spring, Tex., who have formed the Big Spring Youth for Freedom in Vietnam and who have obtained 533 signatures on a petition supporting U.S. policy in Vietnam. The petition reads:

We, the undersigned, as patriotic students of Big Spring Senior High School, in the interest of promoting a better understanding of the prevailing opinion of American youth, and recognizing the right to dissent, nevertheless realizing that any aggression, whether it be fascist, Nazi, or Communist, must be arrested, do hereby proclaim that we support the present U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I compliment these young people on this most impressive statement, and join them in the sentiments they express. It causes a welling pride that students in my area have taken an initiative in this matter, at a time when we hear of the protesters and draft card burners in other parts of the Nation.

The following is an article from the Big Spring, Tex., Herald, which describes this effort on the part of these students.

YOUNGSTERS FAVORING U.S. VIETNAM POLICY

(By Tom Barry)

The effects of the war in Vietnam can be felt thousands of miles away—by politicians, the electorate, demonstrators pro and con—and in Big Spring, where vibrations have reached into Big Spring High School.

Reaction to the war and its implications recently came from three Big Spring High junior classmen, David Thomas, Larry Arnhart, and Dale Pless. They were discussing, these 16-year-olds, Vietnam over the noon meal at the school cafeteria. More particularly, they were discussing draft card burners, beatniks, and the image given by a loudmouthed minority to the majority of teenagers. These boys felt something should be done.

PETITION PLAN

Others were listening to the discussion. Ten in all decided that the thing to do was to get 500 students to sign petitions saying they, even though nonvoting teenagers, support the present policy of the U.S. in Vietnam. When signed, the petitions will be sent to Members of Congress.

Forms were printed, permission of school authorities was granted to pass them out and post them on the bulletin board, and by Friday more than the original goal of 500 signatures of students had been obtained.

Also, the group gave itself a name—Big Spring Youth for Freedom in Vietnam.

Five hundred students represent more than one-third of the entire student body of the high school, according to the youthful chairman of the organization, David Thomas.

"We expect more, and will not close our signature drive until Tuesday," he said. "We have had surprisingly little opposition to the drive," he continued. "We've had more trouble with students signing two or more petitions each than with those who refuse to sign."

David said only three students have refused to sign the petition because they favor getting the U.S. out of Vietnam; and a few more refused to sign because they think the war ought to be accelerated.

Four purposes unite the 10 members of the organization to disavow the draft card burners; to show the adult world how they feel; to encourage representatives in Government; and to support the present policy in Vietnam. Some of the members of the group, like young Thomas, are strongly conservative in their political views; others are on the left side of the fence; and there are some who are middle-of-the-roaders.

After the petitions are signed, they will be divided into three groups of about equal numbers and mailed to Senator JOHN TOWER, OMAR BURLESON, representing the 17th district, and GEORGE MAHON, representing the 19th district.

"We hope we have a better chance of the petitions having more weight by sending them to the three individuals rather than to President Johnson," Thomas said, "after all, in a few years we'll be the ones fighting in Vietnam if the war goes on, and it is an election year, even though we can't vote yet."

About 12 teachers are helping the group in one way or another, Thomas said, putting petitions up in classrooms and passing them around in government classes.

Will the petitions do any good?

"Well," Thomas said, "let's say our hopes are moderate."

"We thought we should do something," Thomas said. "We are hardly the type to demonstrate in the streets, and we know that petitions don't normally get a lot of results, but we wanted to speak our piece."

The vigor with which the 10 members of the organization are presenting their case

for the majority of teenagers (already several teachers have announced open support of the campaign, according to Thomas) indicates that something beyond ignoring the normally quiet, "average" teenager should result.

Excise Taxes To Eliminate Junkyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, prior to his confirmation as Director of the Bureau of Mines last week, Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., noted that very promising progress is being made on the Bureau's research project for the use of automobile scrap in modern steelmaking. In view of the numerous steps that are in the making to contend with the auto junkyard problem, I feel that every Member of Congress should familiarize himself with all facets of the subject.

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 provides that the establishment and use and maintenance of junkyards in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty. Among the provisions are Federal participation in junkyard removal, landscaping and screening, as well as a reduction in federal highway funds to states which fail to provide effective controls.

Also during the last session of Congress, I proposed that 1 percent of the auto excise tax be used by the Federal Government to dispose of auto junkyards, with as much as half of the income to be put into research to determine whether the junked cars have further economic use. Numerous recommendations have come from the general public as well as from interested businesses in response to this suggestion, and meanwhile considerable development toward economic disposal of scrapped cars has taken place. I have received correspondence from representatives of the scrap industry who are convinced that research thus far clearly indicates that the time is near when through proper crushing and incineration old cars can be dismantled and the steel salvaged profitably. Meanwhile Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has invited universities, nonprofit organizations, business firms, and individual citizens to submit constructive recommendations and proposals to the Bureau of Mines for expanded research on disposal of scrap autos and other solid mineral wastes.

The Bureau's own scrap-auto research is described as follows:

Bureau research on the scrap-auto problem is directed toward overcoming presently known economic and technological barriers —such as changes in steel making and automobile manufacturing practices—that have caused once-sizable markets for these discarded cars to shrink. Out of the Bureau's research have come two promising metallurgical processes, both of which are scheduled for early testing in large-scale demonstration plants.

One process involves the conversion of all the iron and steel in auto body scrap to a high-grade iron ore for which there is a ready market. With this process the scrap can be used as a reductant for low-grade, nonmagnetic taconite that is abundant in the United States. This is done by carefully controlled roasting of the scrap and the taconite in a rotating kiln, which converts both the iron in the taconite and the iron and steel in the scrap to magnetic iron oxide. After roasting, any unconverted scrap is screened for recycling, and the iron oxides are concentrated by magnetic separation into a high-grade form of iron oxide. All nonferrous materials in the scrap, as well as the gangue in the taconite, are rejected in the process. By changing the roasting conditions, the process can be made to operate without taconite. In this variation iron in the scrap is obtained as an oxide, which can be separated magnetically from nonferrous contaminating elements in the scrap.

In the other process being developed by the Bureau, cylindrical shaped bales made from cannibalized automobiles, less engines and transmissions, will be run through a rotary kiln at a temperature high enough to burn the combustible materials and melt the nonferrous metal parts. The kiln gases will be cleaned to prevent air pollution. Resulting clean scrap, upon discharge from the kiln, will be compacted to any desired density for steelmaking charges. After the technique for burning and separating nonferrous metals from baled automobile hulls is developed in a pilot plant, a larger demonstration plant including a modern electric steelmaking furnace with necessary accessories will be built for demonstrating the economic feasibility of the thermal treatment technique. The objective is to show that many types of steel can be produced from thermally treated automobile scrap only, and that almost any type of steel can be economically produced from thermally treated scrap and directly reduced iron ore.

Mr. Speaker, as these efforts continue, the number of junked cars to blight suburbs and countryside rises annually. More than 5 million were dumped onto the heaps last year. The president of General Motors predicted on January 17 that the average annual demand for cars and trucks in the United States could exceed 11 million by 1970, thus blazing the way for bigger and bigger junkyards.

While the unsightly cars are piled higher, adjacent land tracts—whether they are business, residential, or farm areas—suffer correspondingly. Regardless of how attractive your own plot of ground may be, its beauty is quickly marred if a neighbor is unconcerned about the trash in his yard. In our particular region of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Electric Co., has long practiced beautifying to the fullest possible extent the properties on which its facilities are located, including the rights-of-way for power lines. Trees are planted and carefully nurtured, and the company takes pride in helping to keep our State beautiful.

Responsible mining companies needed no laws to insist upon reclamation of stripped properties. For years they have been turning earth from which coal has been extracted through surface operations into attractive forest, farm, and recreational areas.

These operations by the utilities and coal companies have been carried out at their own expense, without cost to Federal or State government. By the same token, it would seem reasonable for auto manufacturers and consumers to provide the means for proper disposal of cars that are no longer usable, and the use of a portion of the excise tax would appear to be the least injurious or objectionable means of absorbing the cost.

The Bureau of Mines projects are commendable and should receive high priority, but once a satisfactory method of economic disposal of auto bodies is developed, the Federal Government should retire from this activity and permit commercial growth of the industry. I am hopeful that such plans will be achieved prior to July 1, 1970, in order that it will not be necessary for Federal and State governments to finance removal and screening of auto junkyards, as provided in the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

Newspaper Columnist Joe Crump has observed:

Making junked automobiles commercially profitable is a sure way to remove them from the scene.

With a portion of the excise tax available in support of the junked car disposal program, there is all the more reason to assume that research can and will make it a profitable undertaking.

While some development engineers are confident that small disposal plants—even portable facilities—can dispose of junked cars economically, the concensus would appear to favor—at least in the early stages—large centers to which the steel shells would be hauled from points within a wide periphery. In the latter event, I would hope that automobile transportation firms will be ready to assume a role in the operation without delay. Stackback and piggyback railroad cars as well as the two-deck auto-carrying trucks that move from assembly centers with new vehicles snuggled closely together should quickly be converted for hauling remnants from scattered junkyards to points where giant incinerators have been established.

We are obviously making headway in our battle to eliminate the ghastly auto junkyard. Let us give it a boost by applying 1 percent of the excise tax to this crusade.

VN

A Citizen's Views on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I know that we all receive a great deal of mail these days on Vietnam. This, to me,

indicates a great concern and uneasiness throughout the land. My own mail reflects the obvious differences in opinion and comes from people in all walks of life. The expression and understanding of the writers varies greatly but recently I received a letter from a constituent which so cogently states some of the underlying questions in people's minds, that, with the permission of the House, I would insert it in the RECORD. We have all heard from many sources the arguments for and against our policy in Vietnam; and while I do not agree with all the writer's views, his letter is, I believe, an eloquent effort by a citizen to reason things out for himself.

SIERRA VISTA, ARIZ.,
February 1, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I, as an American citizen and veteran, deplore the ambiguous, indecisive, vicious policies of the administration in regard to Vietnam.

If our objective is to merely stem Communist aggression, why are we unable to enlist wider allied support?

If we wish to be the power in Asia, won't it be necessary to "acquire territories and bases?"

If we are striving for a military victory, why did we engage in a bombing pause or throw ourselves on the mercy of the United Nations?

If we desire peace through the United Nations, why are we bombing North Vietnam?

If the problem is so complex, why do the alternatives of policy, to bomb or not to bomb, sound so simple?

We stand in violation of the Geneva accords and the United Nations' Charter, yet we claim to be prepared to wage a 6-year war to the tune of half a million American men.

Along with an ineffective buildup of strength and a relatively ineffective bombing of North Vietnam, we are to assume that Red China and the Soviet Union will stay out of the conflict in the field.

To disagree with our current policy is not to endorse the righteousness of either the Vietcong or North Vietnam. It is rather to realize that the time for sending living, productive citizens to die for an ambiguous and strange point of honor has passed us by.

And this conflict does hinge on a strange point of honor. Senator JOHN STENNIS has said it was a mistake to enter this conflict, but now that we are committed we cannot back down or withdraw. The commit your policy and your sons to a stubborn position such as this is strange indeed. History will label it not only strange but vicious.

I suspect that since the war is a reality (undeclared and unconstitutionally executed) your mail is divided 10 to 1 in favor of our policy. However, sir, if on the eve of our now vast commitment it had been put to a vote, I wonder if our President would have enjoyed such odds.

Finally, I resent this administration's muzzling of debate. Let me remind you, sir, a conference with 21 congressional leaders is not debate, any more than a public statement announcing the resumption of bombing is debate after this bombing has already occurred.

When you read the opinions of your constituents into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would feel far less helpless if you could express mine in the halls of what was once a vital forum for debating and forming policy—the Congress of the United States of America.

Sincerely yours,

TIMOTHY W. GARGIULO.

The New GI Bill of Rights

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly urged, supported and voted for the new GI bill of rights—H.R. 12410.

This bill authorizes a program of education and training for veterans of military service discharged after January 31, 1955.

The serviceman has met his responsibilities to the Nation. It is the Nation's responsibility to prepare the serviceman returning from service to take his place in civilian life.

I only regret that the benefits of this bill do not come up to those of the Korean war bill. I supported such increased benefits. The administration opposed them and made clear that any attempt to raise benefits would end chances for Presidential approval of the legislation.

ANALYSIS

Education: Provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College-level and below-college-level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Part-time training is permitted. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months. Persons serving on active duty for training do not accrue eligibility. The education and training allowances provided are as follows:

Type of program	No dependents	1 dependent	2 or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full time	$100	$125	$150
Three-quarter time	75	95	115
Half time	50	65	75
Cooperative	80	100	120

Fees and tuition are paid for less than half-time training. Education must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge or 8 years from the effective date of the act, whichever is later. Training is provided for active-duty members of the Armed Forces who have served at least 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955. These active-duty members may receive payments for fees and tuition. Administrative provisions of the GI bill for veterans of the Korean conflict and the war orphans' training program are applicable to this proposed program. Schools will be approved by State approval agencies of the various States, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools.

Guaranteed and direct home loans: Benefits of both the guaranteed and the direct home loan programs are extended to veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guarantee of a loan by a private lender in the amount of $7,500 is extended to this group and, in areas established as direct loan areas where guaranteed financing has not generally been available, a maximum direct loan of $17,500 is authorized. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to regulate interest rates, consistent with the ceiling established for Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses under this program, by requiring the veteran to pay 0.05 percent of his loan at closing.

Non-service-connected medical care: At the present time, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only for service-connected disabilities. This group is made eligible under the provisions of this bill for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as war veterans. Eligibility for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities is based on availability of a bed and the signing of a statement of inability to pay for treatment elsewhere, as is required of veterans of earlier conflicts.

Preference in Federal employment: Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to the group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. This benefit is not extended to those on active duty for training.

Presumption of service connection of chronic and tropical diseases: This presumption of service connection of numerous chronic and tropical diseases, as listed in section 301, title 38, United States Code, now applicable to war veterans, is extended to those veterans with service after January 31, 1955.

Burial flags: The bill will permit the Veterans' Administration to furnish a flag for draping the casket of deceased veterans of service after January 31, 1955, as is now provided war veterans.

Job counseling and job placement assistance: Places veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as veterans of earlier conflicts for assistance through the Department of Labor in job placement and counseling.

Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief: Amends the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act by increasing protection for individuals who are renting homes when called to service from $80 monthly rental to $150 monthly rental.

Recommendations of the Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty and Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the text of a letter to me dated January 31, 1966, from the Honorable Roger D. Branigin, Governor of the State of Indiana, setting forth the recommendations of the recent Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty and Natural Resources.

Governor Branigin's letter follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
Indianapolis, January 31, 1966.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We had a very enthusiastic response to the Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty and Natural Resources, and now must see that every recommendation from

the participants is carefully studied and implemented if possible.

The following recommendations have been brought to my attention by Mr. John E. Mitchell, chairman of the conference and director, department of natural resources. I am referring them to the congressional delegation for further consideration and implementation.

I trust you will find these recommendations both interesting and helpful.

That the Federal grant-in-aids program for the construction of municipal sewage treatment plants be expanded materially in order to insure a construction rate which will provide facilities for the adequate treatment of all the State's municipal sewage within 7 to 10 years. This means at least trebling the currently authorized Federal programs.

That the State of Indiana provide construction grants for municipal sewage treatment plants as a supplement to Federal grants and in an amount sufficient to raise the total grants on each project to 50 percent of the total cost.

That a Federal law be enacted which permits rapid tax writeoff by industry of the investment in industrial waste treatment facilities.

That storage for low-flow augmentation be included in all reservoir developments in Indiana whenever it is practicable or economically feasible. That as a similar contribution to streamflow maintenance, greater consideration be given by local constituents in small watershed programs—to the preservation and restoration of headwater marshes, swamps, and other wetlands which can be useful for water retention and wildlife habitat.

Federal appropriations should be increased under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to assist rural areas in financing water and sewage works. (Presently there is not enough money to meet the demand.)

Sincerely yours,

ROGER D. BRANIGIN,
Governor, State of Indiana.

Redwood National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I joined the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] in proposing the creation of a Redwood National Park in California. Without my knowing or anticipating it, the Michigan Democratic State Central Committee on January 9, 1966, had unanimously adopted a resolution also calling for a Redwood National Park.

You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, my pleasure in welcoming this resolution which coincides so closely with my own views. Under unanimous consent I submit the resolution adopted by the Michigan Democratic State Central Committee calling for the creation of a Redwood National Park to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

RESOLUTION FOR A REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Whereas the California Redwood forests are some of the Nation's most outstanding scenic resources, and the demand of the people of the entire Nation for such irreplaceable areas of spectacular natural beauty is ever increasing; and

Whereas of the over 2 million acres of virgin redwood forest that once forested the northern coast of California there is only one remaining major block of land suitable for a National Park; and

Whereas the area of the proposed park is being logged right now, and the time is almost past when it will be possible to save this area from damage by logging and freeways, and the flood and storm damage which result when the watershed is destroyed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan go on record in support of the establishment of a 90,000-acre Redwood National Park on the northern coast of California in the Prairie-Creek—Redwood-Creek groves and Gold Bluffs wild beach area, as recommended by the National Park Service; and be it further

Resolved, That the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan request President Johnson and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall to make every effort to arrange a moratorium on logging in the proposed park area until Congress has acted on the proposal now before it; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators MCNAMARA and HART and to the Democratic Congressmen from Michigan.

Appointment of Jack Hood Vaughn To Head the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to visit the other body yesterday and to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn, to be the Director of the Peace Corps.

While my primary purpose in testifying was to urge the committee to approve Mr. Vaughn's nomination, I also discussed the role of the Peace Corps in our oversea assistance efforts.

Because of the great respect I have for Mr. Vaughn and the importance I attach to the position to which he has been nominated, I thought my testimony would be of interest to our colleagues and offer it herewith for insertion into the RECORD.

TESTIMONY OF HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, RELATIVE TO THE NOMINATION OF JACK H. VAUGHN, AS DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS, FEBRUARY 9, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful and delighted at the opportunity you have afforded me to testify in behalf of the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn for Director of the Peace Corps. I warmly endorse his nomination.

While I know it is usual to speak primarily of a nominee's qualifications at these hearings, I should like to concentrate first on the importance of the position, for I think it has been underrated both in Congress and by the public.

The Peace Corps too often still today is viewed as a mere idealistic outlet to absorb the energies of the starry-eyed do-gooders of our society. While under the brilliant leadership of Sargent Shriver it has earned universal praise from the complete spectrum of our society—from its most conservative to its most liberal elements—its weight and importance is still not generally recognized. One has but to ponder that one of the President's highest aids, Bill Moyers, aspired to this post as the "Everest" of his ambitions, to come to second thoughts about its significance.

In my view, the Peace Corps demonstrates an approach to success in our endeavors with the developing countries, where all other approaches have to a greater or lesser degree failed. I think I will meet little argument that the future of the world and of our role in the world lies largely with these developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The Peace Corps has proved the validity of working from the bottom up rather than from the top down in these countries. It has demonstrated the success potential of community development techniques of having our people live with the people they are assisting in the slums that surround all of the major cities of these countries and in the countryside in the rural peasant villages. It has demonstrated the importance and practicality of stimulated self-help—and the economy of such programs. It has shown that work in primitive societies does not necessarily require top technical background—that the average citizen of this country can play a meaningful role in the development of a country where infant mortality is over 50 percent and the people don't know the significance of feces disposal, water impurities, or sound diet. It has proved the feasibility and efficacy of intensive language and cultural preparation of our foreign cadres, of having them live within the communities they serve rather than in isolated American ghettos, of having them receive compensation comparable to their host counterparts and play roles not as superior advisers but as coequals.

The future expansion of our foreign assistance endeavors should be along lines demonstrated successful by the Peace Corps—and no more appropriate person could be found than Jack Hood Vaughn to preside over this extension.

Indeed, by standards of experience, knowledge, ability, personality, character, and temperament, no equal could be conjured.

Jack Vaughn is a close personal friend and became so when he was my boss at the Peace Corps. He was Regional Director for Latin America and I, Director of Programs for the west coast of South America under him, virtually from the start of the Peace Corps.

I, therefore, am able to speak of him from a vantage point of an associate as well as a friend, and as a person intimately familiar with the Peace Corps operation he is to head, for I was the second staff member brought on board by Mr. Shriver to formulate the concept of a Peace Corps early in 1961. I can also speak of him from a personal familiarity with his knowledge of Latin America and the respect Latins held for him.

What an unusual combination of experience. Jack Vaughn has served in virtually all of our overseas agencies—the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America and before that as Ambassador to Panama; our foreign aid agency as mission director in Senegal; he started his Government career in the early days of USIA in Bolivia and Costa Rica; and, of course, he served as a Regional Director of the Peace Corps itself.

The geographic diversity of his foreign experience has been broad, bringing him in direct contact with two of the three continents of the world with which the Peace Corps deals—Africa and Latin America—and with incomparable breadth and depth where

the greatest Peace Corps concentration of activity lies, in Latin America.

Jack Vaughn's rise to responsibility has been meteoric and hard won. He came up the hard way, by his bootstraps. It's a real American success story worthy of Horatio Alger—how a golden gloves fighter from Columbus, Mont., going under the inauspicious pseudonym of "Johnny Hood" made good. He graduated from the University of Michigan in 1943 and volunteered for the Marine Corps where his talents earned him promotion from private to captain in just 3 years. He got a master's degree from Michigan when he got out and taught there and at the University of Pennsylvania. In 1949 he offered his services to USIA and from there had the spectacular span of Government service and rise of personal success previously recounted.

In the Peace Corps, Jack Vaughn built the Latin American program from insignificance to the dominant program. He was a man who was universally respected in a highly competitive organization and whose advice and counsel were sought by all. As a boss, he encouraged his associates to innovate and inspired from them an indescribable devotion which led to uncanny productivity. This human quality no doubt played an important part in his continuing series of successes and his warm following among his associates and the foreign peoples with whom he worked. He was immensely popular and respected both as Ambassador to Panama and previously as ICA mission chief in Senegal as well as at his other posts. The universal acclaim he received from all Latin capitals during his recent trip as Assistant Secretary of State is well known and recognized as a major contribution to our Latin American relations.

It gives me great pleasure to give this nomination my unqualified praise and to urge upon you and the committee the confirmation of a most unusually well qualified man for this job of great national and international importance.

Mission Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. EVANS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, although Hanoi and Peiping have thus far given only negative responses to peace overtures, we are continuing the search for a door which will one day lead to peace. We can be encouraged that efforts toward peace are being taken by the United Nations, by the Pope, by various governments, as well as by private diplomatic explorations.

And we can all be encouraged by the bold and positive move which our President took in going to Hawaii.

In an editorial dealing with the mission to Hawaii, the New York Journal-American commented that it will be of great advantage for President Johnson to meet personally with the two ranking South Vietnames delegates, and it adds:

Indeed, the meeting will be of equal advantage for the Vietnamese. Direct, blunt talks between the leaders of the two Governments can only result in closer understanding of each other's problems and an improved cooperation in pursuing the war.

The newspaper concludes that "once again President Johnson has made a bold and positive move with regard to the explosive Far East situation, and the Nation should solidly support him in his effort."

I think many of my colleagues may want to read the editorial in its entirety, and with this in mind, I submit it for the RECORD.

MISSION TO HAWAII

President Johnson's sudden trip to Hawaii to confer with top American and South Vietnamese officials on the Vietnam war is further evidence of the mounting gravity of that conflict and of the administration's preoccupation with ending it.

Significantly, it marks L.B.J.'s first departure from the continental United States since becoming President.

Hawaii is a logical place for so top-level a conference. As well as being the closest the President should go to Vietnam, as far as his personal safety is concerned, Hawaii is also the command center of all American military operations in and off Vietnam.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, American commander in Vietnam, reports to the Hawaii headquarters of Adm. Ulysses S. Grant Sharpe, commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific. In turn, Admiral Sharpe reports to the Pentagon, which then reports to President Johnson. Thus the President is, in effect, temporarily shortening this lengthy chain of command by his visit.

It will also be of great advantage for President Johnson to meet personally with the two ranking South Vietnamese delegates, Premier Nguyen Cao Ky and Chief of State Nguyen Van Thieu.

Indeed, the meeting will be of equal advantage for the Vietnamese. Direct, blunt talks between the leaders of the two Governments can only result in closer understanding of each other's problems and in improved cooperation in pursuing the war.

Once again President Johnson has made a bold and positive move with regard to the explosive Far East situation, and the Nation should solidly support him in his effort.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko—Hero of Two Worlds

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, Americans and Poles alike celebrate the anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Polish soldier and statesman. His unswerving dedication to the great cause of national independence for both the United States and Poland earned him the title of "hero of two worlds."

Thaddeus Kosciuszko was a man of action, of great courage, and of an undying belief in the right of every nation to be free. When the American Revolution erupted, he hastened to this continent to fight for American independence. To the cause he brought great skill as an engineer and great personal valor, and in 1783 a grateful United States of America extended to him the privilege of American citizenship and the deepest thanks of the American Congress.

His task in America done, Kosciuszko returned to his beloved Poland to join in the struggle to prevent the third and final partition by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The Polish patriots, led by General Kosciuszko, defeated the Russians at Raclawice and ably defended the beautiful city of Warsaw but were at last overcome by the superior numbers of the enemy. In the battle of Maciejowice on October 10, 1794, the gallant Poles were defeated and their leader was taken prisoner by the Russians. Released 2 years later, General Kosciuszko dedicated the rest of his life to efforts to obtain Polish independence.

Mr. Speaker, the torch of freedom has been passed to our generation of Americans and Poles. We gain inspiration from the great hero Thaddeus Kosciuszko and on this day reconsecrate our lives to the great cause of freedom to which he gave his best.

New England's Economic Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the economic headaches we in New England have suffered almost since the end of World War II are a familiar story to most Americans. While the country in general progressed and moved forward to new records of prosperity each year, New England for a long time lagged behind. We were in a virtual depression while the rest of the Nation enjoyed an unprecedented boom.

We lost the bulk of our textile industry. Because of economic stagnation, we lost our young people who migrated to the areas of greater opportunity. We lost industry, manpower, and economic resources.

But as dramatically as the nightmare began, so apparently has it ended.

New England has bounced back. Today it is an economic success story of major proportions.

Those of us who are privileged to serve the six great States that comprise the New England region are justly proud of the progress, the imagination, the initiative, and courage that are so much a part of New England traditions and which have been demonstrated again so well in recent years.

This week the pages of the U.S. News & World Report magazine contained an excellent story about our economic comeback. The article deals specifically with the causes behind both our economic decline and our unprecedented rejuvenation. Credit is given where it is due—primarily to the businessmen and industrialists, to the economists and planners who could see through the despair of one generation to the bright opportunities of another; who could remember the resourcefulness and optimism of a bygone day when New Eng-

land, and our great city of Boston, was truly the Hub of the Universe.

The adaptation of existing resources to modern problems, the initiation of important new industries keyed to the unique skills and capabilities of the New England region lie behind our success story.

I feel the aforementioned magazine article deserves to be read by all Americans and certainly by the Members of this body. In my opinion it contains some valuable seeds of wisdom for those of us whose job it is to ponder the scope and efficacy of government with respect to regional economic problems. I therefore have asked unanimous consent to reprint the article in full at this point in the RECORD, and respectfully commend it to the attention of my distinguished colleagues.

The article follows:

NEW ENGLAND'S BIG COMEBACK: LATEST SUCCESS STORY

BOSTON.—New England today is enjoying a boom unprecedented in history—and one which is steadily gaining momentum.

The upswing is broadly based. It extends to nearly every major industry and to almost every community of the six-State area.

Employment in New England in 1965 moved past the 4 million mark—the highest on record. Gains were reported not only in the region's factories, but also in a number of service industries of growing importance to its economy. Among these are insurance, financial, and business services, medical service, education, and recreation.

Construction, which trailed the rest of the country's industries last year, reached new levels. Spending for plant and equipment rose 18 percent in the region in 1965, and a similar increase is forecast for this year.

Throughout New England, unemployment is low and labor scarce. It is not just skilled labor and technical employees that are needed. Many employers would be overjoyed to find unskilled workers who could be trained. Help-wanted advertisements in the major newspapers are at an alltime high. Some areas are running short of housing for recently hired workers and their families.

UP FROM ADVERSITY

The current boom is something new and welcome in New England. Since the end of World War II, the region's economic growth had consistently lagged well behind that of the Nation as a whole. Regional comparisons usually had shown New England bringing up the rear in nearly every measure of economic progress.

Many of New England's woes were traceable to the loss of a big segment of an important industry—textiles. Scores of major firms picked up stakes and moved to the South to take advantage of lower wages, land costs, and taxes, and to be closer to raw materials and major customers.

Left behind were factories of Civil War vintage, blighted cities and pockets of massive unemployment.

Other long-established industries—shoes, shipbuilding, fishing, and paper—either declined or showed slow growth.

The States, particularly Maine and Vermont, suffered heavy losses of workers as residents moved out to find new jobs. Says one Vermont official of that period: "Our biggest export was our young folks."

New England came to be viewed by the rest of the country as worn out, ultraconservative, lacking vitality, and removed from the mainstream of postwar prosperity. As one Connecticut official remembers it, "People came to think of New England as having nothing to offer but stone fences, lobster pots, wooden bridges, and Yale University."

THE SPREAD OF SUCCESS

A unique feature of New England's newfound prosperity is that the northern tier of States—New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont—is sharing in the uptrend. Even in good times, these States usually had lagged behind southern New England. Connecticut for many years has been better off than the rest of the region and unhappy over being tarred with the same brush.

Now the fastest-growing State in New England is New Hampshire. Unemployment there is the lowest in the Nation. In 1965, unemployment averaged 2.9 percent of the State's labor force, compared with a national figure of 4.6 percent. Industrial construction in New Hampshire in 1965 was up 400 percent from the 1964 figure.

BEHIND THE BOOM: BRAINPOWER

What has happened to change the picture in New England so suddenly?

Many of the region's top economic experts admit they are stumped for an answer. One explains it this way: "It is all very vague, you cannot measure it by statistics. But New England today has a competitive advantage over other areas. This advantage boils down to this—brainpower."

Long a leader in the field of education, New England lately has been getting a big payoff from this investment. The brainpower advantage is traceable, mainly, to the big three of its prestige universities—Harvard, Yale and, especially, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

MIT is a university completely built around science and technology. Because of its pioneering work in electronics, it was selected as the site of the Government's World War II research laboratory that perfected radar. This was a huge effort, comparable to the Manhattan project, which developed the atom bomb. Top scientific and engineering personalities were drawn to MIT from all over the United States.

Another wartime laboratory at MIT did early work on guidance systems and fire-control techniques. Today, the university is heavily engaged in guidance systems for missiles such as Polaris and for the Apollo moon vehicle.

When Soviet Russia exploded a nuclear bomb in 1949, the Federal Government called on MIT to develop an intercontinental defense system. A new laboratory was built on Route 128, a highway that encircles all of Boston but the waterfront. In the process of developing the new system, major advances were made in computer technology. Among universities, MIT is the largest computer research center in the world.

OFFSPRING OF MIT

To supply the new laboratory with needed parts and materials, a number of small firms began to spring up along Route 128. Many top scientists and engineers left the laboratory to form their own firms, to exploit their knowledge in a new and expanding technology.

With MIT spawning new ideas, with top-notch scientists and engineers, and new companies, the Boston area became a leader in the field of electronics and research-oriented industry based on new technology.

Once a country road, Route 128 today is bordered by new plants. A recent survey showed 574 firms along the highway, employing nearly 55,000 people. Included were almost 100 manufacturing firms, 66 research companies, and 56 engaged in both research and manufacturing. Since 1962, there has been a 45-percent increase in the number of firms along the golden semicircle, as it is now called.

Graduates of MIT, who once left New England to take jobs in more prosperous areas, now seem to prefer to settle in or near Boston and to work in one of the many laboratories or electronics firms. Says an MIT official:

"As top scientists moved into this area, more and more younger men wanted to come and rub elbows with them. They were attracted, too, by the cultural advantage of the New England area. Culture is an 'in' thing with these highly educated people. We have more Ph. D.'s per acre around here than any other place in the country."

Recently, MIT set up four new research centers—space sciences, life sciences, earth sciences and materials science and engineering. Coming is one in communications.

There is no evidence that the birth of new firms is slackening. It appears more likely to increase. University officials say that revolutionary changes may be ahead in the field of biology. Some new fields being studied by MIT's laboratories include oceanography and medical instrumentation.

Other major New England universities also are beginning to expand research activities.

SEARCH FOR PLANT SITES

The mushrooming growth of electronics and related research firms is by no means confined to Route 128 or the Greater Boston area. Successful firms seeking sites for new plants are pushing out into southern New Hampshire and, to a lesser extent, Maine and Vermont. Connecticut and Rhode Island, as well, are gaining new industries.

The growing interest in siting plants in northern New England is due, in part, to a desire to get away from big-city congestion and problems. Vermont, for example, stresses its "moral climate" in newspaper ads. Says one: "Vermont has no really big cities with snarled transportation, strife, crime, bureaucratic waste, poor housing, air pollution and all the other seemingly hopeless problems of large metropolitan areas today."

INDUSTRY FIT TO AREA

The growth of research-oriented industry fits in perfectly with New England's needs. The region does pose handicaps for mass-production industries. It is poorly situated with respect to the center of U.S. population. It has high transportation and electric-power costs, and is lacking in most raw materials.

Because of these deficiencies, New England is specializing more in low-bulk, high-value products. "Even in electronics," comments one observer, "when something is developed suitable for mass production, it is usually produced elsewhere. Then the research people come up with something new. We have to keep running all the time."

Throughout the region, there has been a steady shift to new products and procedures based on research. A study in 1955 showed about one third of factory employment depended on products not in existence a decade earlier. A similar study today, experts say, would show this figure to be about one half of total manufacturing employment.

New Englanders believe that their combination of brainpower and a skilled, adaptable labor force will enable the region to keep abreast of new developments. They also see the growth of research-based industry as giving New England a stability it never had before.

NEW ROLE FOR OLDER INDUSTRIES

Some long-established industries also have played a role in New England's upswing.

One of the most important of these is transportation equipment. United Aircraft, centered in Connecticut, is the region's biggest private employer. Its payroll is approaching 70,000 and has been increasing at a rate of 1,000 a month as the firm seeks to keep up with orders for jet engines, helicopters and other aircraft components.

Another big employer, General Dynamics' Electric Boat division at Groton, Conn., has built much of the U.S. nuclear-submarine fleet. It has been stepping up production, hiring more workers. A large number commute from Rhode Island.

The machine-tool industry, long important to the area's economy, is showing new strength. Employment in this industry tends to rise and fall in line with capital spending by firms across the country. With plant-and-equipment spending at high levels, and further gains projected, the industry is expected to continue to lend its weight to the boom.

TEXTILES: NO LONGER A DRAG

Even the textile industry, which for many years acted as a drag on New England's economy, added slightly to its payrolls in 1965. During the postwar period, employment in the industry had fallen from 275,000 to about 100,000, but now it appears to have stabilized at that level. Most of the cotton-textile industry already has been lost, and remaining firms produce mostly woolen yarns and fabrics—a more expensive product.

The leather and shoe industry has been adding workers. Much of it has shifted out of older Massachusetts towns with high wage rates to newer plants in Maine and New Hampshire. The area continues to produce one third of the leather footwear made in United States.

Shipbuilding, which had been in the doldrums for years is showing new life—partly as the result of growing defense needs. There also has been heavy new investment in the paper industry, important to Maine.

New England's biggest growth, however, has not been in manufacturing, but in services. This includes a whole grab bag of activities.

Among the most important is medicine. The Boston area is one of the world's major medical centers. Doctors and patients come from Europe, Latin America and other parts of the world for training or treatment.

Education is another big service, and New England is the leader in the field. Harvard, Yale, MIT and Brown, plus a host of smaller schools such as Dartmouth, Amherst, Williams, and Middlebury, are among the Nation's top-rated educational institution.

Many of the largest insurance firms have headquarters in New England, especially in the Boston and Hartford areas. Boston is one of the four largest financial centers in the United States. Its investment houses handle most of the major mutual funds.

WINTER PLAYGROUND, TOO

New England always has been a popular arear for summer vacations, and its share of the recreation industry is growing steadily. In 1965, excellent weather brought huge gains in the tourist business.

Now, the region is experiencing a winter-vacation boom. Ski resorts are rising all over, especially in the northern tier. Building of new lodges, motels, and roads has had a major impact on the construction industry. It is also driving up land prices. In one part of Vermont where land sold 5 years ago for about $5 an acre—less than it cost in 1760—the price rose to $200 an acre or more when a new ski center went up nearby.

Vermont has the fanciest of the new ski resorts. Some offer such lures as heated outdoor swimming pools, sauna baths, ice skating, closed gondolas to take people up ski slopes, rather than T-bar lifts or rope tows, and cocktail lounges, night clubs, and theaters.

The 1965–66 ski season got off to a roaring start. A 40-inch snowfall in Vermont in December is estimated to have been worth $250,000 an inch to the State. Holiday ski business in some areas ran 200 percent ahead of last season.

THE MULTIPLIER EFFECT

Skiing has what is called a "multiplier effect." State officials estimate that, for $1 spent for skiing, an additional $4 is spent for food, lodging, liquor, entertainment, gasoline and other needed goods and services.

Northern New England is one of the few undeveloped areas left in the Eastern United States. It is accessible to huge population centers in both the United States and Canada. Roads are being improved, making it easier to reach. With more people having 3 weeks or more of vacation a year, many employers are urging workers to take part of their vacation in winter—and New England is benefiting from this trend.

New England also is getting a boost from another development—the desire of many American families to own two homes. More and more high income families that live along the eastern seaboard want to get away from the congestion. With increased interest in skiing and other winter sports, people can use a second home in winter as well as in summer. This two-house trend is adding to the rise in land values, especially in southern Vermont and New Hampshire.

CITIES: MIRRORS OF PROSPERITY

The effects of prosperity can be seen by driving through some of New England's cities.

Greater Boston, still the "hub" of New England with 3.2 million of the region's 11.2 million people, has been changed radically in appearance by a group of new buildings.

In 1965, the $160 million Prudential Center, which now dominates the Boston skyline, opened its doors. In process of construction is a $200 million Government center in the heart of the city. The first building of the center to be completed, a $26 million State office building, was opened last year. Just finished is a new Federal office building. Still under construction: a large, crescent-shaped office building and a new city hall.

Another skyscraper nearing completion is the State Street Bank building, adjacent to the financial district. It was financed by British investors.

Construction is about to start on a $60 million electronics-research center for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It will rise close to MIT, across the Charles River from downtown Boston.

Boston also is having a boom in apartment construction. A large, high-rise building is going up across from the Boston Common. Others have been built overlooking the Charles River and in outlying sections of the city.

Progress is being made on new highways and expressways. In 1965, the last link of the Massachusetts Turnpike was completed, bringing it into the downtown part of Boston.

Urban renewal is evident in many other cities of New England. Hartford and New Haven in Connecticut have completed huge projects that have revitalized large areas.

A further example of a city which has come back is Providence, R.I. For many years, this city was listed as a "depressed area" by the Department of Labor, with "substantial and persistent unemployment." Last May, Providence and its environs were taken off the list. In October, joblessness was down to 3.9 percent—lowest figure in 15 years.

Providence has been helped by a new interstate highway which cuts through the center of the city and links it closely to Boston on the north and New York on the south. The highway has opened new industrial sites, and the city could become an important distribution center.

More spectacular than the progress of some of the larger cities is the change that has taken place in scores of smaller cities which were hardest hit when their textile mills closed their doors and moved south.

THE NASHUA STORY

Nashua, N.H., lost its major textile employer in 1948. In an effort to find jobs for thousands of people thrown out of work, a tax-free, nonprofit foundation was set up to buy the mill properties and either sell or lease them to any prospective employer.

Today, hardly a square foot of factory space is available of the 2½ million square feet originally purchased. Instead of one firm employing 3,500 workers, the space is occupied by 24 separate firms employing more than 6,000 workers.

In addition, the city has 16 new plants—five of them built by firms which outgrew their space in the old mill. Manufacturing employment, which stood at 8,400 before the textile plant left, has grown to 13,000.

Nashua, in fact, now has a labor shortage. Firms in the area are estimated to have 2,000 jobs they are unable to fill. As 1965 ended, unemployment was down below 2 percent of the labor force.

Much of the same story is true of Manchester. After the loss of a huge textile mill, Manchester had staggering unemployment. Like Nashua, it is now booming, has a much more diversified industry and is looking for more workers.

Another city which has gone from bust to boom is Burlington, largest city in Vermont. It lost its major employer, a large woolen mill. Burlington took a different tack. Instead of trying to interest employers in the old mill property, business leaders formed an industrial corporation and raised money to build a plant on speculation. They snagged International Business Machines. Employment at the plant has risen from 500 to 2,500 over the past 18 months.

THE AREA'S SERIOUS PROBLEMS

New England is not without problems. Railroad service is poor—Maine is the first State to be inaccessible to passengers on regular schedules by rail—but expected mergers of New England railroads with major rail networks may help.

The threat of severe drought hangs over the region unless it gets heavy winter snows and spring rains.

Some of the older cities still have financial problems and urban blight. Others have exceptionally high property taxes that could discourage new industry.

Another worry is that much of the boom in industries such as electronics, shipbuilding and transportation equipment is due to defense orders. Any major cutback in defense spending could have a heavy impact. But many business leaders aware of this danger are making efforts to diversify.

Right now, however, New England's greatest problem is its labor shortage. Both government and business leaders are making concerted efforts to attract labor.

Some employers are considering trying to recruit Cuban refugees, or Puerto Ricans and Negroes from crowded eastern cities. At present, New England has few nonwhites. Vermont's population is .002 percent Negro. Many New Englanders say they would like to keep the racial balance the way it is now.

IS THE COMBACK PERMANENT?

Because of New England's large urban population and heavy industrialization, few experts believe the region can match newer areas such as the Southwest or Far West in growth rates. But they see the present boom as more than a cyclical revival.

"The east coast still has the Nation's biggest market, the biggest population," says an industrial development official in Connecticut.

And, it appears, the view that New England is decrepit, out of tune with modern times, will have to be reviewed and updated as the boom continues.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam is being covered by New York Post Correspondent Pete Hamill. From that strifetorn area of the world he has been writing a series of articles which are very revealing.

On February 8, 1966, he discussed the Vietcong in his second article. I am sure my colleagues will find the following of interest.

VIETNAM: THE ENDLESS WAR—ARTICLE II: THE ENEMY

(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—The boy was about 17 and he was squatting in the shade of a long, barracks-style building at the edge of a dusty road leading out of Ben Tre, in the Mekong Delta country. He had a close crewcut, hard black eyes behind a high ridge of cheekbones, and he was dressed in black pajamas and sandals cut from rubber tires. Three weeks before, he had deserted from the Vietcong.

An interpreter asked him why he had left. He looked up at the two American visitors. The interpreter asked him again. He started talking softly in the singsong cadence of the Vietnamese.

"He says he was tired," the interpreter said. "He says that he did not want to join the Vietcong anyway. He says they made him join. They told him that if he did not join they would chop off his index finger so that he could never fire a gun for the government. He says he had no choice."

The young man said that he had spent most of his 2½ years with the Vietcong in flight. His guerrilla unit of about 100 men traveled by night, slept in caves and tunnels by day. Most of their attacks on isolated hamlets and villages took place at night. He personally had killed 14 men, he said, and others had killed more than 50.

"He says that he wanted to live a normal life," the interpreter explained. "He says he wanted to have a wife and children and to work on some land. He wants to be left alone."

It could be said that most Vietnamese agree with him. There is no farmer, on either side, who wishes to live with the constant threat of Vietcong terror, American defoliation and bombing raids, or the conscription drives of the Vietnamese Army. But the war will not go away. Neither the Vietnamese, nor the Americans, nor the Vietcong will allow it to go away.

There are still great empty spaces in the known history of the Vietcong revolution, but the basic outlines are on the record. The roots of the movement lie in the long struggle against the French which ended in the slaughter of Dienbienphu and the complex of agreements made at Geneva in 1954.

Under the terms of the agreements, most of the Viet Minh—northerners and southerners—went to North Vietnam. About 5,000 stayed behind, to insure a revolutionary base in the event that the government of Ngo Dinh Diem reneged on the Geneva agreements. Diem had never signed those agreements (and neither had the United States) and showed his contempt for them by canceling the 1956 elections whose purpose was to reunify the country. There is some evidence that Ho Chi Minh was not anxious to face a free election that year either, because of peasant unrest in the North. But Diem was apparently convinced that Ho would be elected and canceled the elections anyway. Most observers here feel this was the most crucial decision Diem ever made, and that it was the wrong one.

There is no way to determine at this date what might have happened in South Vietnam if Diem had not been installed as leader. The country might have fallen to the Communists immediately. Most people at the time of the Geneva agreements gave him only a few months. But Diem was tough and resourceful, a man with an iron sense of righteousness. He broke the power of the religious sects, and crushed the criminals who ran Saigon like a private fiefdom. For a while, people talked of the miracle of Diem.

But by 1957 the revolt in the countryside was already underway. Some of the suppressed Cao Dai and Hoa Hao sectists joined the Vietcong, and the first sporadic raids on hamlets and villages started. By 1958, the revolt was spreading, and Diem reacted exactly as the Communists had expected. All opposition—Buddhist, nationalist, democratic—was labeled "Communists" and ruthlessly repressed. When a relatively free election was held in 1959, and Dr. Dan—an anti-Communist and anti-Diemist—was elected to the National Assembly, Diem reacted by imprisoning him. Many of Dan's supporters switched allegiances to the Vietcong because there was simply no other viable political organization.

One of the classic strategies of guerrilla war is the isolation of the countryside from the cities. Ho Chi Minh marched into Hanoi without ever fighting for that city. He didn't need to; he had the countryside. The Vietcong began a systematic campaign of blowing up bridges and railways, of cutting communication lines, of tearing up highways. They were isolating the city from the country with little serious opposition and they were aided in their work by the intransigent character of Diem himself.

There is neither room nor need to relate here the whole dreary story of Ngo Dinh Diem. Most of it is known: his remote, monastic character, his Catholic religion, which put him in a minority in his own country, his Mandarin background, his repression of the Buddhists, his growing fear of and separation from the people he ruled, his weakness in the face of the ruthlessness of his brother Nhu and his famous wife. The story has been told many times. But as Fidel Castro needed his Batista, the Vietcong needed a Diem. They thrived under his attempts at suppression.

Since the Vietcong could never compete with Diem's arsenal of American weaponry, they returned to the tactics used successfully at the beginning of the Viet Minh revolution. They used selective terror: assassinating unpopular province chiefs, tax collectors, conscription squads. In especially intransigent areas, they made examples of people loyal to the government. They struck swiftly, and brutally, often under the noses of government forces. In those places where they were not thought of as true representatives of the people, they became a mysterious, all-powerful enemy capable of striking with deadly effect whenever they wanted to.

From a hard core of 5,000, they soon grew into an army which now stands at about 150,000 in main-force battalions, with another 100,000 in looser guerrilla companies. (Essentially there are three kinds of Vietcong: the main-force soldiers, organized in battalion and regimental units and capable of conventional stand-and-fight warfare; guerrilla units, used for ambushes, swift harrassing strikes and terror; and local squads, made up of men who farm by day and freelance at terror at night.)

They set up a political arm in 1960—an amorphous, almost invisible organization called the National Liberation Front, and began demanding aid from Hanoi and Peiping. The NLF included non-Communists, Buddhists, and members of other groups united by opposition to Diem. Its platform was relatively mild. It began turning out trained political and military cadres and the drift of southerners from North Vietnam along the Ho Chi Minh trail began accelerating.

Today, the Vietcong is the most powerful political organization in the country.

Some well-informed Americans I talked to in Saigon point to the very anonymity of the Vietcong leadership as proof that the entire revolution emanates from Hanoi.

"Where is the Fidel Castro of this movement?" one of these men said. "Where is the Ben Bella? The Lenin? Why is the National Liberation Front so amorphous? The only reason can be that in the event of victory the only Communist personality in Vietnam can assume command. That's Ho Chi Minh. It's in his interest to keep the leadership anonymous. If the Vietcong win, he can move in and take the credit. If it get licked, he can blame it on the anonymous leaders. And if any of the NLF men get uppity, they can be murdered without fanfare. It's as simple as that."

It may not be as simple as that, but something which is obvious after weeks of crisscrossing this country is the tenacity of the Vietcong in the areas they control. Before any overt move is ever made against a village or a hamlet, the Vietcong intelligence men make careful, detailed surveys of the situation. All those capable of leadership or opposition are assassinated. A "shadow" system of government is set up, so that political control can be effected immediately. The process of selective terror stifles grumbling and opposition.

"They administer their areas with absolute control and great efficiency," one American adviser in the delta told me. "They run their own mail system, their own system of domestic courts, even their own public works programs. In every single case I know of, they govern their villages with greater efficiency than the Government does, and with a greater sense of justice. It's not nice to say so, but this is unfortunately the truth."

Most American military men I've spoken to also admire the Vietcong as soldiers. "They have great discipline, dedication, and courage," a marine major said. "If the Vienamese Army fought half as well, this war would have been over 3 or 4 years ago."

Despite some slackening of morale, and the manpower shortage, the Vietcong remains a formidable enemy. They might be beaten in any single large-scale military action. But most observers here feel that they will be around for years to come.

"They have a lot of the people on their side," one American province representative for the AID program said. "As long as they have that popular support, they will keep fighting. The way things are going, that could be for the rest of the century."

Too Smart To Fight?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I reported to the House of Representatives on the approval by the Department of Defense of my bill, H.R. 12522, to establish a special educational and physical rehabilitation program for

dustry in general, and this has been of particular benefit to the textile industry. A more rapid tax depreciation schedule was instituted in 1961 and 1962, and corporate taxes were reduced in 1964 along with personal income taxes.

While these actions helped to strengthen the financial condition of the textile industry, even more basic changes in cotton production and cotton pricing policies were essential to the long run health of the cotton and textile economy.

The cotton program which had served the Nation well for many years had simply run out of gas. Cotton exports were declining, cotton consumption in domestic mills was losing ground to test tube fibers, and the cotton carryover was increasing rapidly.

New cotton legislation was enacted in 1964. It helped in some ways. It made the breakthrough on one-price cotton but the 1964 cotton program was not a success. You will recall that in 1964 many of us, and I include myself and I know many of you here, claimed that the move to one-price cotton would increase domestic consumption by more than a million bales and bring about a reduction in the cost of cotton goods to the consumer. We were wrong and it became obvious that a new program was needed. With the new legislation the carryover of cotton continued to increase; the annual cost of the cotton program moved toward a billion dollars and it appeared it would continue to rise.

This was the setting in which we considered cotton legislation in 1965.

The legislation we adopted last year sets price support loans at near world prices and should enable cotton to move freely—and without Government participation—in domestic and world markets. A system of direct payments will maintain grower incomes at levels which will enable the farmer to meet his costs and obtain a decent income for himself and his family.

With our price support loan at 21 cents per pound for the 1966 crop, and our export prices at more competitive levels, we can, and should have, larger cotton exports. Although exports during the current season will be low because countries abroad will be reducing their stocks on hand in anticipation of lower U.S. prices for the 1966 crop, we expect exports in the 1966–67 marketing year to increase sharply. Part of this increase will be to replenish the low stocks which will be held abroad on August 1, 1966, and part will be the result of the new program and its effect on production abroad.

We expect the new legislation to slow the rate of increase of world cotton production—but not to cause a decline in cotton production abroad. Lower cotton prices can encourage the consumption of cotton abroad because of more effective competition with rayon.

Slight changes in the rates of growth of cotton consumption and production abroad can cause a rather significant change in cotton exports from the United States. Cotton production abroad (excluding mainland China) totals around 31 million bales and cotton consumption is around 34 million bales. Foreign consumption has been increasing at a rate of about 2.7 percent a year and foreign production about 4.1 percent a year for the past 10 years.

If we could slow the rate of growth in production by just 1 percentage point and increase the rate of consumption by just 1 percentage point, U.S. exports could reach roughly 6 million bales in about 2 years. This is the kind of effort we must be making.

With higher exports and strong participation by producers in the new cotton program, we can bring a substantial reduction in the present record 16 million bale cotton carryover. Production on an annual basis likely will decline about 1.5 to 2 million bales from the recent levels of about 15 million bales.

Another factor which can help increase cotton consumption, and speed the decline in carryover, is an effective cotton promotion program. Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced yesterday a bill to establish a self-help research and promotion program for cotton. I believe this kind of activity can benefit the whole industry and consumers and taxpayers alike.

But the rate and extent to which the mountainous surplus of cotton is reduced will depend, as much as anything, on the actions and policies of you in the textile industry. In effect, it is within your power to help determine how successful the new cotton program will be, and whether the American people will accept it as reasonable public policy.

I emphasize this fact, not because it is a startling revelation, but rather to impress upon you the need for us to continue the spirit of cooperation which has brought the Nation's economy to its present level of efficiency and prosperity.

When the search for an effective cotton program began, the textile industry took the position it would support any program which would achieve one-price cotton. You soon discovered that sound public policy was not that simple. You had to decide what that policy should be, and then to give active and sustained support to that policy as it was being developed in the Congress.

There is no less need today for responsible action on the part of the textile industry.

Since early in 1964, prices paid by domestic mills for cotton have declined about 9 cents a pound. In 1964 the index on broad woven goods and yarns declined as well. It is an interesting fact that, during this same period, imports went down and exports went up.

Then late in 1964 the price on woven goods began to rise—the prices on yarns began to rise. The price for broad woven grey goods, for example, has increased nearly 8 percent during the period from 1964 to date. What has happened? Exports of cotton textiles have declined and imports of cotton textiles have increased.

This is what I am referring to when I suggest that you and everyone in the textile industry needs to give your full consideration and your every thought to action in this vital area of the cost of goods.

While it is true that mill consumption did increase last year by some 200,000 bales over 1964, to a level of 9.2 million bales, declines in exports and a sufficient increase in imports to bring about a 400,000-bale balance in favor of imports indicates that this is a 400,000-bale domestic market the textile industry has turned over to foreign producers.

I am sure we both recognize the value and worth of this new one-price cotton program, and we must make every possible effort to insure that it works for the benefit of all segments of the economy. Our failure would be a smashing blow at the textile industry of this Nation.

That is why I have come here tonight. We are beginning a new phase of the cooperation which has brought us a long way from the dismal outlook of just 5 years ago.

I pledge you to carry forward the spirit of cooperation undiminished, and I am confident that you will do the same.

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

[Mr. ASHBROOK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TRADES WITH NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, American men are dying in Vietnam to preserve the free world from further encroachment by Communist aggressors.

It is ironic, therefore, that our free world allies persist in permitting their shipping interests to trade with North Vietnam. Although the exact figures are classified, it is a matter of record that in 1965 there were more free world than Communist ships carrying goods to and from North Vietnam.

Regardless of their cargoes—and we have only the assurance of the shipping firms involved that they consist of nonstrategic goods in most cases—this amounts to giving aid and comfort to our enemy. This is an economic war as well as a military conflict. If economic pressures can be applied to Ho Chi Minh, they must be, just as they have been to Castro.

I say it is time for the United States to talk the only language these free world foreign-flag shippers apparently understand: serve notice on them that they cease delivering goods of any sort to Hanoi or stand barred from doing any business at all in U.S. ports.

I am today introducing legislation which would prohibit foreign vessels which trade with North Vietnam not only from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes but from doing any business at all in our ports. I urge the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to take prompt action on this bill.

SKI WEEK IN THE BERKSHIRES

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, thanks to swift action by both the House and Senate last month we have just observed National Ski Week. May I say, as the Representative to this body who enjoys serving perhaps the finest large-scale ski area in the Nation, I welcomed the proclamation and the national observance.

I think it is entirely in keeping with the renewed emphasis in recent years from the National, and State and local governments on outdoor recreation and on wholesome sports activity in which all may participate. It also stresses the encouragement of recreational development of otherwise marginal mountain areas which we in Massachusetts have been doing for some years.

For anyone who skis, I know I need not extol the merits of the Berkshire Mountains in my district. Spotted throughout the Berkshires are the resorts and ski areas of Berkshire Snow Basin, Bousquet's, Brodie Mountain, Burrington Hill, Butternut Basin, Catamount, Chickley Alps, Dutch Hill, Jiminy Peak, Jug End, Otis Ridge, Petersburg Pass, and Thunder Mountain.

I am equally proud of Avaloch, Springside Park, Goodell Hollow, Happyland Ski Area, the Thunderbolt Trail on Mount Greylock, Oak N' Spruce, Osceola Playground, Pittsfield State Forest, and Shaker Village on Mount Lebanon.

Also in my district are the ski facilities of Cheshire Ski Area, Eastover, Mount Mohawk, Mount Tom, the Northfield Inn, and the Sawmill Hill Ski Area.

Most of these are as familiar to skiers as the names of Hialeah, Aqueduct, and Churchill Downs are to horse players. These resort areas and ski slopes rank among the best in the world and annually draw thousands to the Berkshires.

I am personally proud to serve the many enterprising and forward-looking men and women who have taken the initiative in developing these fine facilities in anticipation of the present boom in skiing and other winter sports. They are performing an invaluable service to the economic and physical well-being of our State and of the Nation.

Of course, the idea of ski week is nothing new to these ski lodge innovators. For quite some time now, most have been offering a package 5-day ski week for winter vacationers at reduced rates. The response has been most gratifying. Most of these package deals include lodging from Sunday through Thursday nights with skiing from Sunday through Friday. Many include ski lessons, meals, and special entertainment.

Prices start about $40 on up for the 5-day deal, a bargain in these days of increasing prices and costs. Full details, I might add, are available from the Berkshire Hills Conference in my hometown of Pittsfield, Mass.

The Berkshire Eagle, the largest daily paper published in my district, recently ran their annual ski supplement issue. While I regret that the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are not equipped to reproduce the many fine illustrations which graphically reveal the scenic grandeur and fine facilities awaiting the skier in the Berkshires, I can request consent to include as a part of my remarks one of the articles from this special supplement. I am sure you will agree it captures some of the flavor of excitement and good fun that is an integral part of skiing and for which we designated National Ski Week.

The article follows:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Dec. 11, 1965]

CATERING TO SKI

(By Lee Goerlach)

Berkshire resorts have catered to the ski bunny so effectively that winter may supersede summer as the busy season, despite Tanglewood and various other summer attractions.

Realizing that the majority of their guests are tackling the long boards for the first time, the resorts tailor their programs to a beginner's apprehensions.

Guests are pampered, protected, and taught the fundamentals of the sport by instructors chosen for personality and patience.

"We need men who can teach our guests how to put on their skis and walk, and how to do a snowplow, then stop at the bottom of our little hill," owner George Bisacca of Eastover in Lenox, says.

"We keep an eye on them, even to anticipating falls. If our efforts to keep them on their feet fail, we pick them up and serve them soothing hot chocolate right on the hill if they are shaken.

"We get them before they are beginners," Eastover ski director Jeff Roche says. "They become so accustomed to being served that they are apt to walk off the hill, leaving their skis behind them. So we pick up the skis and put them back where they belong. The key word here is attention."

Proving that nothing is too good for his guests, Bisacca installed a 1,500-foot chair lift last year to supplement the little rope tow.

The fact that he didn't have a hill big enough for the chair didn't faze Bisacca. He bought a neighboring hill and moved all 14,000 cubic yards of it truckful by truckful to Eastover.

Swimming, movies, skating, dancing, and various after activities keep the guests happy even if rain washes out the ski hill. "And skiing is so leisurely that we stop at noon for a full-course meal," Bisacca said.

This is the pattern in varying degrees at all four Berkshire winter resorts. With the exception of Avaloch in Lenox, all have snowmaking.

At Jug End in South Egremont, skiing seems more serious than at the other resorts. Ski director Dave Scott received his U.S. Amateur Ski Association (USEASA) certification along with Olympic skier Andrea Mead Lawrence last winter.

"I'll put my ski school up against the bigger areas anywhere," he says. But diplomacy and the value of individual attention also are part of the training he gives his staff.

"Focus your smile on the homeliest girl in the class." Dave tells his instructors. "She will be pleased and the rest of the class will love you for it. If you choose the prettiest girl, everyone will hate you," he warns.

Dave is from northern Ireland and has his full share of Irish wit and charm. "I'm probably the only certified instructor in the world from northern Ireland," he says.

Jug End has a 1,500-foot T-bar and a rope tow. The hill is challenging enough to attract transient skiers. Jug End also conducts a program for children of nearby towns. About 50 youngsters (from 9 to 16 years old) participated in the third year of the program last season.

Oak n' Spruce in South Lee also has a USEASA certified ski director, Rainer Schmidt of Germany, who has taught in famous ski areas all over the world, according to resort owner Frank Prinz.

Oak n' Spruce has the smallest hill and smallest snowmaking operation. "Isn't it ridiculous," Frank says, as he proudly displays the miniature electric compressor. "But it keeps the hill covered. That is what counts."

The South Lee resort has the largest skating rink of the foursome. It floods the tennis courts.

"We offer social skiing, a combination of both daytime ski activities and nighttime pleasures associated with resort life," Prinz says. "Our slopes have been designed for the novice. Our ski school knows how to instruct the beginner. The slopes are not challenging enough for the experts. The expert can find his match at nearby Berkshire ski areas."

Avaloch added a 1,000-foot T-bar to its ski complex this year. The 18-sided Gazebo, which serves as a summer dining room, is flooded for ice skating. Guests are provided most anything they ask for.

"We have a juke box and hi-fi for dancing, but if the crowd wants live music, we'll provide it," Manager Dave Green says.

Owner Michael Bakwin directs the ski program, assisted by Ed Weiss of Lenox. Accommodations are limited to about 100 overnight guests at present. But ground is being broken for an additional 20 units. "We expect the T-bar will increase interest enough to warrant construction of a ski lodge next season," Green says.

Swiss fondues, ski talk around the fire at night, parlor games, ping pong, skating on illuminated rinks—you name it, and the Berkshire resorts have it. (If they haven't got it, they'll get it for you.)

All four resorts have special midweek rates that run about half the cost of weekends or holidays. All four have rental equipment. Seldom does a beginner have his own skis and boots. When he does, they are apt to be unsuitable.

Dave Scott tells, for example, about the 86-year-old doctor from White Plains, N.Y., who arrived in class with head skis, marker toe piece and turntable heel with longthongs, equipment usually worn by racers or hot shot skiers.

Dave assumed that the doctor was one of the rare species to show up at a resort—the expert. But the doctor had never before been on skis. He had purchased the unsuitable gear from a salesman obviously as unfamiliar with skiing as his customer.

This was New Year's 2 years ago, a bitterly cold day if you remember. The doctor may not have known his ski equipment, but he knew frostbite when he saw it. About halfway through the lesson he said to Dave, "Sonny, your ears are turning white, you'd better go inside."

Eastover attracts mostly single people. The others have everything from singles to families. Some come dressed in the latest style. Others ski in car coats and levis.

"One girl had such an extensive wardrobe that she changed her clothes several times a day," Jug End's Scott remembers.

"By and large we get family groups at Avaloch," Green says. "We still are host to singles in tour groups in January through March, but have mostly families on holiday weekends. Except for the tours, ours is a family business."

There is very little repeat business from the resort skier. "We get a whole new wave each season," Bisacca says. "Once the ski bug bites them, they go off to ski at the big areas," Prinz agrees. "We are the cradle of the industry."

Guests arrive at the resorts on Friday night for the weekend.

"They dance until midnight, then are up at the crack of dawn waiting in line at the ski shop to be fitted to boots and skis," Prinz says. "They stay up until all hours again Saturday. By Sunday they start to wear out a little. Activity on the ski slopes doesn't start until about 11 a.m. And they start leaving for home by late afternoon."

U.S. POSITION ON VIETNAM

(Mr. BROOKS (at the request of Mr. TODD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson went to Honolulu with the overwhelming support of the vast majority of the people of this country. I think the cause of peace can best be served at this juncture by reaffirming that support and making it clear to all the world.

What is the United States trying to accomplish in Vietnam? The answer to that question is quite clear. It is the same answer we have been giving for more than 10 years. We are in Vietnam to reaffirm the right of any people to determine its own destiny in its own way. We are there to prove that force and violence are no longer acceptable ways for any power to impose its will upon its neighbors. The fact that the kind of force and violence being em-

ployed in South Vietnam is aggression in a new disguise does not change the nature of what we are trying to do. President Johnson has stated our purpose in Vietnam again and again. He has said:

Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way. We will do everything necessary to reach that objective and we will do only what is absolutely necessary.

I wish it were possible—

And I am still quoting the President—to convince others with words what we now find it necessary to say with guns and planes: armed hostility is futile—our resources are equal to any challenge—because we fight for values and we fight for principles, rather than territory or colonies, our patience and our determination are unending. Once this is clear, then it should also be clear that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement.

President Johnson has said on a score of different occasions that he is prepared to go any where, any time, and discuss with any government a peaceful solution for Vietnam—unconditionally. Dozens of world leaders have urged the Communists in Hanoi and Peiping to participate in such discussions. They have refused. They are trying to keep discussions out of the United Nations.

It is obvious that the Chinese Communists and probably the Communists in Hanoi do not want to talk peace. They do not want to talk peace because they still believe that they can achieve a military victory. They believe that we will get tired of the struggle, that the American Government will lose popular support and be compelled to retreat.

They are wrong.

We know they are wrong.

Support for American actions in Vietnam is and always has been widespread among the American people. This can be amply demonstrated by quotations from two great Americans. One is from a letter written by President Eisenhower to Prime Minister Churchill in 1954. Speaking of the situation in southeast Asia, President Eisenhower said:

If I may refer again to history, we failed to halt Hirohito, Mussolini, and Hitler by not acting in unity and in time. That marked the beginning of many years of stark tragedy and desperate peril. May it not be that our nations have learned something from that lesson?

Now here is another quote from that same year of 1954. This was a speech at Harvard University by General Eisenhower's chief political opponent—the late Adlai Stevenson:

It has fallen to America's lot to organize and lead that portion of the world which adheres to the principle of consent in the ordering of human affairs. It is an assignment we undertook not by choice but by necessity and without prior experience. The burden is without historic parallel and so is the danger, and so is our response. The first phase is ending. The outward thrust of aggression in Europe has been arrested. Now we shall have to address ourselves to Asia, to perpetual siege and to the unending tasks of greatness. For the quest for peace and security is not a day's or a decade's work. For us it may be everlasting.

There you have the political consensus in America on the subject of aggression in southeast Asia. We have not changed. Today we have a Democratic President—and he enjoys the same firm support from Republican former President Eisenhower that General Eisenhower received from Mr. Stevenson.

There are some who are honestly and sincerely confused about what is going on in South Vietnam. And there are some others who are more than willing to increase the confusion. But the facts speak for themselves.

What is being attempted in Vietnam is the same cynical totalitarian aggression we've fought for a generation. Only now it is trying out a new strategy. It is now trying to prove that a small group of well-armed and ruthless terrorists can be sent into a country to first subvert its government and then to enslave its people before the world realizes that an invasion has begun.

The whole history of our century proves conclusively that the appetite for aggression is unlimited. There is no known instance of an aggressor leaving his neighbors alone because his appetite was satisfied. If we do not stand by South Vietnam today, then—as surely as night follows day—we will be called upon to face the challenge somewhere else tomorrow.

President Johnson has chosen to face reality and meet the challenge here and now. He has the firm support of the vast majority of the American people.

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

[Mr. MOORHEAD'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A FARCE IN ONE ACT

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, considerable attention has been devoted of late to what might occur in various of our State legislatures following reapportionment on a population-only basis.

Those of us who support the pending reapportionment constitutional amendment affecting State legislative reapportionment believe that the ultimate decision in such a vital area of government must lie with the American people themselves. That is the purpose of the pending resolution regarding reapportionment.

This issue is clear and fundamental.

The point, I believe, is interestingly made in a recent column appearing in the San Francisco Examiner by Jack S. McDowell where an excellent, whimsical commentary on the problem is set forth.

With unanimous consent, I therefore ask that this article be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Nov. 2, 1965]

A FARCE IN ONE ACT

(By Jack S. McDowell)

SACRAMENTO.—The time: 1967 or thereafter.

Californians have been saved from themselves by the U.S. Supreme Court. Reapportionment, back in 1965, made all State senate districts about equal in population—but not in geography or economic interests. Some new senators now represent a dozen counties.

Senator Paul Pullet of the first senatorial district answers the phone in his office in Petaluma. Sam Sawtooth, one of his constituents in Crescent City, is calling (at 90 cents for the first 3 minutes).

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Senator, a number of us are having nothing but trouble from the division and we need your help.

Senator PULLET. Always glad to help the people of our district, sir. Why don't you and your associates drop around to my office right after lunch and——

Mr. SAWTOOTH. After lunch. Why, Senator, it's 333 miles from here to Petaluma, not counting detours around the bridge washouts.

Senator PULLET. Yes, you are in the northern neighborhood of the district, aren't you? Well, maybe we can handle it on the phone. Now, you mentioned trouble with the division. Which division of the agriculture department is that, sir? Compliance, or the bureau of poultry inspection?

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Ag, shmag, Senator. I'm talking about those division of forestry guys.

Senator PULLET. Oh, forestry, huh? Hmmm. Well, what seems to be the problem, Mr. Sawtooth?

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Well, one of those division guys got so noisy shouting the rulebook at two of our scalers that the whistlepunk got so rattled he signaled wrong, somebody hit the winch and we almost laminated one of our best toppers into about 500 board feet of second-growth.

Senator PULLET. Scalers? Whistlepunk? Topper? Uh, by the way, Mr. Sawtooth, what's the name of your firm?

Mr. SAWTOOTH. The Mountainside Logging Co.

Senator PULLET. Logging? Oh, yes. I've heard of your company many times. Fine reputation. Well, it sounds as if you do have a problem and I will demand a full report from the director of agri * * * I mean from those forestry people. By the way, Mr. Sawtooth, how did you people up there ever come to plant redwood trees instead of raising chickens or some nice wine grapes?

As the senator hung up, his secretary stopped in.

"Senator Quartzly wants you to call him right away at his office at the Modoc Mining Co., in Alturas," she said. "He wants to know what peach blight and pear decline are, because he just told some of his Stanislaus County constituents he'll introduce a bill to have them repealed."

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

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

JUDGE PERRY B. JACKSON

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, between November 1947 and February of 1954, it was my privilege to serve as associate judge of the municipal court of Cleveland, a trial court of general jurisdiction in the city of Cleveland. In the course of this association, it was my privilege to serve with the Honorable Perry B. Jackson who has since become a judge of the court of common pleas of Cuyahoga County.

During my two terms of office on the Cleveland municipal court, I had the opportunity to frequently counsel with Judge Jackson and very often relied on his wise experience in trial procedure and legal research.

On Thursday, January 27, Judge Jackson celebrated his 70th birthday. His life story is a story of perseverance and integrity. Mr. James T. Cox, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, paid proper tribute to this eminent jurist on Sunday, January 23. Mr. Cox's article follows:

JUDGE JACKSON TURNING 70—RACIAL EMPHASIS ERASED

(By James T. Cox)

Judge Perry B. Jackson considers as one of his lesser achievements his indirect responsibility for tradition-bound newspaper writing in Cleveland.

For many years after 1942, when he was appointed a Cleveland municipal judge by Gov. John W. Bricker, a typical newspaper story about him would start like this: "Judge Perry B. Jackson, the first Negro to serve as a judge in Ohio."

Times changed, as do social attitudes. A Negro on the bench is commonplace today. And newswriting concentrates more on the person, not the race.

Judge Perry Brooks Jackson, now on the common pleas court bench, will celebrate his 70th birthday Thursday. He will be in court that day, presiding at a murder trial.

He wants only one birthday gift: an abundance of energy to preside at trials for many more years.

At 70, every man is entitled to philosophize a little. Sitting in his court chambers last week at the close of a trial day, a desk lamp reflecting on his ever-present Phi Beta Kappa key, Judge Jackson did just that.

"Oh, I guess I have much to be thankful for," he said, "and I thank Almighty God for giving me talents, the energies and the desire for public service. For giving me the finest parents a man could want, and the most devoted wife in the world.

Throughout his life, one of his talents has been for hard work. To earn his college and law school tuition, he worked at a variety of jobs—bus boy, waiter, steel mill employee.

"Those were the days, though, when it was literally possible to work one's way through college. The tuition today makes that ideal prohibitive," the judge said.

"Of course, the money was not as good in the old days. The summers I worked in a steel mill I worked 60 hours a week, for $9.60—a week. The next summer I got a rise—to 18 cents an hour, or $10.80 a week.

As a young man with a fresh law degree in 1922, Judge Jackson tried to prove to a law school dean that a large law firm would hire a Negro.

"After about a month of job hunting, I had less than a dollar in my pocket. An uncle gave me an old desk and chair, and I started my own practice in the anteroom of another Negro lawyer's office. The dean had been correct."

In 1942, Judge Jackson said, the time was at last politically "right" for a Negro judge.

"The feeling in Columbus, however, was that because four Negroes had been previously defeated for municipal judge, it might be best to appoint a Negro to the bench, to 'prove' to the community that a Negro was capable of doing the job, so to speak.

"To be quite honest, however," the judge said, "the idea of 'the first Negro' is more often annoying than amusing. One has hardly heard of the first Italian, or the first Jew, to hold an office. Only the Negro. You only have to study the mayoral race here last November."

This "first" concept does have rewards, however, he admits.

"As a judge, and as a representative of the Negro community, I was asked to serve on many civic committees. Too many, in fact, so I was able to recommend other Negroes. You'd be surprised how quickly the white community discovers the large number of qualified people in a minority group that can do an equally good job."

The youth who came from Zanesville carrying a cardboard suitcase containing a meager supply of clothes and a few celluloid collars, was elected to three terms in municipal court and elected twice to the common pleas court bench. He will be running again this November.

The signal honor in his life was receiving an honorary doctor of laws degree from Western Reserve University, in 1961.

"I believe," he says, "that an honorary degree given by one's college is the finest award a man can receive in his lifetime. That is how I feel about mine."

He did not say so, but Judge Jackson was the first Negro awarded an honorary degree by WRU.

PIGGYBACK RAILROADING

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

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more interesting to observe than a new idea that grows to be a success, bringing more efficient services to the public as well as profit to those who carry out the idea.

Right after World War II, a new idea was called "Piggyback Railroading." It was a proposal that the railroad and trucking industries cooperate to their mutual benefit by the transport on the railroads of loaded trailer vans over long distances. Upon arrival at the destination, tractors would be ready to pull the trailers away to distribute the goods at various warehouses. Piggyback railroading caught on and today comprises a large part of railroad business.

Now we observe the development of another piggyback program—called piggyback marketing by the Department of Commerce, although a more accurate name would probably be cooperative exporting.

The concept is easy to understand. It refers to a situation in which the products of smaller companies ride the back and shoulders of larger, big-name companies into world markets that would otherwise be difficult or impossible to reach. The Department of Commerce acts as a middleman or clearinghouse in order to bring prospective carriers and riders together.

Just as examples, a large flour milling company exports the jams and jellies of a small businessman; and a big steel corporation markets the metal doors and frames made by a small company.

When agreements between companies are worked out, the result is new opportunities for sales and profits for businessmen, in that it permits exporting by small companies whose marketing organizations are not geared to overseas trade. It enables the big companies to broaden the product lines which they can offer overseas and to bolster their export sales.

Though the mechanics of a piggyback operation are fairly basic, the arrangements vary from company to company. The most common arrangement is simply one in which the big company buys the products of the small company outright at the best price it can get, and sells on its own terms. Other arrangements are those in which the big company buys the smaller company's product at discount or it may sell for a commission.

The carrier companies also vary in deciding what products they will market. All companies want products they can market at a profit, but in addition, some companies will market only those products which are related to their own. The piggyback process is not necessarily limited to products that round out a marketing package, however. It can involve a variety of goods whether related or unrelated.

The clearinghouse services of the Government include communicating with companies established overseas to determine if they are interested in selling a product. Then when a rider company applies for carrier service, the Government supplies it with the names of three interested carriers and helps the rider and carrier firms arrange negotiations. To expand the efficiency and scope of the program the Department of Commerce is now setting up an automatic data processing system which will enable it to pinpoint which U.S. companies might piggyback for which rider companies. It is anticipated that the computerized system will be ready by late spring, at which time the information will be available to any American manufacturer interested in the program. The eventual agreements regarding terms and cost are privately negotiated by the companies involved, with no government participation.

All in all, piggybacking or cooperative exporting seems to have a very bright future. A firm interested in the idea either as an exporter or as one which would like to export need only contact the Assistant Director, Bureau of International Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. The local Commerce Department field office will also furnish information regarding this program.

Through piggybacking, thousands of companies whose business is now con-

Because of the superb record which the owners of co-ops have established, the Congress, last year, established a separate mutual fund for the cooperatives. It was our intention at that time—and I am speaking as one of the sponsors of this legislation—to create a special management fund for all management-type cooperatives, so that their premium payments, administrative costs and any losses, would be segregated from the general fund. We provided that when this management fund was sufficiently strong, the FHA would distribute shares or rebates to the co-op owners whose premiums had provided this strength. In fairness, we also stipulated that no such disbursements may be paid out until any funds which might be transferred to the management fund from the general fund, had been reimbursed.

Since that time, the question arose as to whether this reimbursement requirement applied to initial transfers to the management fund, or only to any loans which might be made to that fund by the general fund. The obvious answer is that it applies only to subsequent loans, and the FHA apparently understands this to be the case. However, lest there be any possibility of misconstruing congressional intent on this point, I introduced a bill today to make this absolutely clear. In addition, the bill provides that the Commissioner of the FHA will transfer to the new management fund, an amount equal to the premiums already paid by the co-ops which will come under that fund, minus the administrative expenses theretofore incurred. In this way, the management fund will reflect the full strength of the co-op program, right from the start.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have drafted is designed to overcome a key obstacle to the implementation of the mutuality provision we enacted last year. At that time, we amended section 213(m) of the National Housing Act to authorize the transfer of funds from the general insurance fund to the management fund, and we provided that before this transfer could be effected, the mortgagee or lender would have to consent to the transfer. There is no legal basis for requiring this consent, for it was not required in the case of other funds which were consolidated into the general fund. In any event, mortgagees have disapproved the transfer of at least 69 cooperative funds, thus thwarting the primary aim of those of us who fought for mutuality. Their disapproval of these transfers is based upon a restriction on the use of FHA debentures, which appears to me to have been a result unintended by the drafters of that provision. I therefore introduced perfecting legislation to remove this restriction. With the restriction removed, the requirement of consent is no longer appropriate and accordingly is also removed. Thus, all accounts of management-type cooperatives will be transferred into the management fund, which we established for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the sole objective of the legislation I have introduced today is to provide equitable treatment for owners of management-type cooperatives. Where a class of property holders has demonstrated over the year its determination and ability to meet its obligations, they should not be called upon to bear the brunt of the defaults of other classes of property holders less heedful of their responsibilities. Outstanding performance must be recognized and rewarded. This has been my steady purpose over the past years, and this is my purpose today. I shall exert every effort to secure the early enactment of this necessary legislation, and I invite all my colleagues to join me in this endeavor.

COLD WAR GI BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted with the Senate acceptance of the so-called cold war GI bill of rights. This is a testament to the hard work and dedication of two men: OLIN TEAGUE, the able and beloved chairman of our Veterans' Affairs Committee, and Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the respected and learned gentleman who chairs the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs in the other body.

Chairman TEAGUE, the author of the Korean war GI bill, initiated both the interest and the legislative action on this issue 8 years ago, and I think he is truly deserving of our heartiest compliments. I know how gratified he must be to see his long years of work come to fruition, and I commend him for his steady and inspiring leadership . It has been a privilege to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee under his wise and skilled leadership.

Senator YARBOROUGH has labored long and hard for this noble objective. His leadership in the other body, and the public support he inspired, was vital to the realization of this goal. It was a privilege to witness the Senator's testimony before our committee last August. It was a remarkable presentation and clarified many aspects of this subject, contributing greatly to its success.

I think that the veterans of this country, and we in the Congress, can count ourselves fortunate that we have leaders of the caliber of these two gentleman from the Lone Star State of Texas. For without their high purpose and tenacious perseverance, this historic legislative achievement would not have been possible.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FILING OF REPORTS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight Saturday to file reports on several bills, including H.R. 12264, 12265, 10431, 10674, 1784, and H.J. Res. 343.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WORK OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, to our ornithological galaxy about Vietnam—the hawks and the doves—we now add the cuckoos.

Since Columnist Walter Lippmann is the creator of this aviary, I suggest he identify the new species by reading that lulu, the Declaration of Honolulu.

In this, without consultation with them, the American taxpayer and public pledge themselves to "the work of social revolution" in Vietnam and "to the attack on hunger, ignorance and disease" there.

These aims are laudable. I only wish we could carry them out at home. I was, however, apparently under a grand delusion: I thought we were fighting with arms to defeat Communist armed intervention in South Vietnam.

With due respect to all concerned, I can only say that this compulsion by the administration to support the whole world is a real bird.

BUTTER AS WELL AS GUNS TO THE VIETNAMESE FIGHTING THE COMMUNIST INVADERS

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Declaration of Honolulu is a true lulu.

The American taxpayer is now pledged to give butter as well as guns to the Vietnamese fighting the Communist invaders. We are pledged to "social revolution" in Vietnam at the same time the administration has cut the school milk program for needy American boys and girls for fiscal 1967 from $30 million way down to $21 million. This is declared to be an austerity move in connection with Vietnam. This is what we used to call playing up to a neighbor while starving your own family.

This is the first practical step by which through the Federal Government, the American taxpayers are going to raise the standard of living of the whole world. Let us hope this does not end up as such efforts usually do in lowering the standard of living in our own country.

The administration took what its spokesmen concede, is a calculated gamble in trying to produce both Federal guns and Federal butter here at home. Apparently someone forgot our kids would have to give up the milk to make the butter.

I suggest this financial irresponsibility, this making the taxpayer without asking him finance a world "revolution," is opposed to everything usually regarded as American.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS COMMITTED THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER TO FINANCING A SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, now that the administration has committed the American taxpayer to financing a social revolution in Vietnam, I wonder how they are going to make sure our social aid of millions or billions does not help the Vietcong.

If there are any true experts on Vietnam, the results to date there do not show it. But I have read in various publications, and in statements by our military, that one of the problems in South Vietnam is that the Vietcong are shooting at our American men one day and peacefully hoeing the primitive fields the next after burying for the time their weapons.

Do our Far Eastern wizards have some way of making sure that most of our taxpayers' money will not reach these farmers so peaceful one day and killing Americans and the innocent in Vietnam the next?

It has been noted that we have been pouring $600 million down the social rathole in Vietnam and the Vietcong still fight.

Anyway, I thought it was the Soviet Union that fostered world revolution, not the United States. Are our taxpayers to be treated like serfs and called upon to pay and pay and pay to help foreigners to a revolution without being consulted, let alone having a chance to vote?

BIG MEETING OF THE BRASS IN HONOLULU

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, we had a big meeting of the brass in Honolulu to deal with the rice paddy branch of the Great Society. A joint pledge was made for a "revolution"—a "social revolution"—which we are to finance.

This is the first practical demonstration we have had of committing the American taxpayer to pay for raising living standards through Government aid in all parts of the world. Outside of the fact that this could well break even this rich country, I find the idea of our conducting "social revolutions" and financing them abroad rather frightening.

I should like to point out that the administration has been pouring $600 million of your money and mine into social reform in Vietnam and, as far as I can learn, the Vietcongs have not even been driven from the south of Vietnam yet.

Maybe if we pour in more of what the administration clearly regards as our unlimited resources, the Communists will not just hold their own but will win in Vietnam. The loser so far, anyway, is the American taxpayer who is tapped daily for some new giveaway.

ADEQUACY OF U.S. SHIPPING

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

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the first 3 days of House Merchant Marine Subcommittee hearings on the adequacy of U.S. shipping in respect to Vietnam have been informative and enlightening. I am confident that these hearings ordered by the distinguished chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], will focus attention on the broader question of the sufficiency of the American merchant marine in relation to its ability to carry our oceanborne commerce and assume the burden of military logistical support when called upon.

The U.S. public must take a greater interest in our merchant marine. More people must seek answers to why American-flag ships carry less than 9 percent of our goods today and why we rank 12th among shipbuilding nations of the world.

I must, in all candor, say that I was amazed at the budget request for appropriations for only 11 to 13 ships for fiscal year 1967 under the Federal ship construction program. In view of the possibility of a long drawn-out conflict in southeast Asia and other U.S. commitments throughout the world, this meager budget request seems incomprehensible. In 1959 the Maritime Administration recommended a level of 20 ships per year. Surely our needs today are not less. In 1961, 31 contracts for ships were awarded; by 1965 this figure had dropped to 14 ships.

There are few if any members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee who agree with the recommendations of the Interagency Maritime Task Force—comprised of representatives of nine Federal agencies—calling for a drastic curtailment of the ship construction program and for building of American ships in foreign shipyards. In my opinion such a policy would be self-defeating and neither in the interests of our maritime industry nor our country.

Mr. Thomas Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, was a witness today at the Merchant Marine Subcommittee hearings. Mr. Gleason has visited Vietnam on at least two occasions at the request of our Government. He testified that new ships can be unloaded 100 percent quicker than the old Victory ships and at 100 percent less cost to U.S. taxpayers. In reply to a question I addressed to him regarding the cut in ship construction funds that would allow no more than 13 new ships for fiscal 1967, Mr. Gleason commented:

> The Egyptians build more than 13 ships per year.

The distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON], a member of the subcommittee, has spoken of the reserve fleet as a "pile of iron" that "cannot be activated fast enough."

Mr. Speaker, we cannot consider one phase of the plight of our U.S. merchant marine without considering the total picture. There must be speedy and drastic action to preserve the American merchant marine, to strengthen it, and to improve upon its quality. Certainly we have some of the most modern and up-to-date ships afloat, but we must look at the entire fleet and act accordingly. It has been my personal opinion for many years that the so-called runaway flag device should be curbed and many more cargo vessels should be built each year in U.S. shipyards with help from the U.S. Government.

The President of the United States in his 1965 state of the Union message pledged that he would recommend a new policy for our merchant marine. I sincerely hope that the Chief Executive will now consider it timely to introduce a bold new program calling for more U.S.-built ships of the highest quality, equipped with the most up-to-date equipment.

END U.S. DISCRIMINATION ABROAD

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

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the President to end the religious discrimination practiced in the assignment of U.S. employees to some overseas posts. This outrageous practice is preventing assignment of qualified Jewish employees to U.S. posts in Arab bloc countries.

For several months I have been investigating this matter and my inquiries have now produced an admission of the administration's discriminatory practice in a letter which I have received from the Department of State.

By its demonstrated willingness to go along with the anti-Semitism practiced by these Arab bloc countries when assigning U.S. personnel abroad, the administration is guilty of following a double standard, properly outlawing discrimination by private employers at home but improperly discriminating in assigning its own employees abroad.

The Department of State informs me that:

> While the United States does not normally take into account the religion of its employees in assigning them for duty abroad, this is regrettably a factor which cannot be ignored in the case of certain countries whose policies in this respect we cannot control however much we disagree with them. The United States tries not to assign any employee to a country where he will be unacceptable to the host government.

U.S. military and civilian employees are required to state their religion when applying for a visa to enter Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Republic. The State Department advises me that "a person of the Jewish faith might not be allowed to enter these countries."

The administration defends its discriminatory practice by pointing out that any government can refuse to accept an

political activity of the great union organizations of this country.

It would be only a manifestation of the tremendous political influence exercised by trade unions, an influence out of all proportion to its numbers, and an influence that sometimes flouts the popular will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. It is inconceivable to me that a man should be required to pay a tribute for the privilege of earning his bread. It is inconceivable to me that the unions would be so preoccupied with the goal of compulsory unionism that they would resort to the use of political threats, such as they have done.

I have received notification from union leaders, not of my State, I may hasten to add, but without my State, threatening me with political extinction if I continue to oppose repeal of section 14(b).

Perhaps they do have the power to extinguish me politically, but if I should lose my seat in this august body because of my position on this issue, it is well worth it, because I believe that those of us who oppose repeal will prevail, and regardless of what happens to us in the future, I believe generations of Americans yet to come will thank us for preserving one last vestige of freedom in the United States, and that is the right of a man to seek employment to better himself, and to sustain his family regardless of whether or not he belongs to any organization, regardless of whether or not it is in his conscience not to belong to such an organization.

Therefore, Mr. President, I trust the Senate, in its good judgment, will vote against cloture.

VW

WHAT GENERAL GAVIN REALLY SAID ABOUT VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield not to exceed 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Harper's magazine for February 1966, in its department termed "The Easy Chair," has published an article entitled "A Communication on Vietnam," written by Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, retired.

Inserted prior to this article, and signed "The Editors," is a statement which starts as follows:

In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva.

As the result of this testimony, in a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Tuesday, February 8, I asked General Gavin if it was true that he urged the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam. He said that that assertion was not true.

I then asked General Gavin if it was true that he recommended a halt in the escalation of the ground war. He said that it was not true.

I then asked the general if it was true that he recommended a withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnamese coast. He said that that was not true.

Because of this extraordinary development in the discussions about Vietnam, I ask unanimous consent that the covering letter in this magazine, signed "The Editors," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM FROM GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts "to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

General Gavin argues for such a change in policy on purely military grounds. His views on the Vietnam war cannot be taken lightly, since he has established a reputation during the last 30 years as one of America's leading strategic thinkers. At the time of the French defeat in Vietnam, he was Chief of Plans and Operations for the Department of the Army, and his advice is generally believed to be largely responsible for the United States' refusal to enter the southeast Asian conflict on a large scale at that time. He enlisted in the Army as a private in 1924 and rose to the rank of lieutenant general before his retirement in 1958; he had a distinguished combat career as a paratroop commander in World War II; and he served for a time as Chief of Research and Development for the Army. After retirement he was Ambassador to France, and is now chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., an industrial research firm in Cambridge, Mass.

He left the Pentagon because of disagreements on what was, in 1958, the basic military policy of the Eisenhower administration. His reasons for such disagreements were set forth in his book, "War and Peace in the Space Age," published by Harper & Row; as he indicates in the following letter, most of the changes he then urged have since been carried out.

The editors hope that General Gavin's communication may stimulate a searching reexamination of American military and foreign policies by other public figures who are especially qualified by experience and training to discuss them. In the coming months Harper's hopes to publish further contributions to such a reappraisal.

THE EDITORS.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a colloquy between General Gavin and myself on this subject.

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

Senator SYMINGTON. General, it is always a privilege to see you, sir. The reason you are here is because of a letter you wrote to Harper's magazine. Did you discuss the letter with the editors at the time you sent it in?

General GAVIN. No, I did not, Senator SYMINGTON.

Senator SYMINGTON. I will make my questions as short as possible and would appreciate your answers being as short as possible, because of the 10-minute time limit.

I would run through the letter with you, if I may.

General GAVIN. Surely.

Senator SYMINGTON. The editors say, "He urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam"; is that true?

General GAVIN. No, it is not true.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then they say you want "a halt in the escalation of the ground war." Is that true?

General GAVIN. No, it is not true.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then they say you recommend "withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnamese coast"; is that true?

General GAVIN. Not true.

Senator SYMINGTON. I wonder why the editors deceived as to what your thoughts were?

General GAVIN. I do not know. I suggest you bring the editor in here and talk to him.

Senator SYMINGTON. That might be a good idea because, based on what the general says, this statement by the editors who published this article is false, and is one of the reasons why there has been so much misunderstanding.

General GAVIN. Yes, I agree with you.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, later on in this hearing the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] again brought up this matter, asking for clarification. General Gavin took the same position with the Senator from South Dakota that he did with me. Then he volunteered that a Harper's magazine advertisement in last Sunday's issue of the New York Times magazine which said that he, Gavin, was challenging "Johnson's strategy in Vietnam" was wrong; and that he had written Harper's as follows:

"I was shocked to see the advertisement in yesterday's book review section of the New York Times," and I was, because it misrepresents entirely my point of view.

In order that the truth as to what General Gavin actually did say be reported accurately, not only to the Senate, but also to Congress and the people, I ask unanimous consent that this part of the dialogue between the Senator from South Dakota and General Gavin be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

Senator MUNDT. I think maybe part of the problem which has confused the public may come from what the editors of Harper's said about your use of the word "enclave."

Of course the general public is hopefully looking for any way, as we all are, to avoid the war from getting any greater, and the grasp on this phrase. The editor said:

"In the following letter General Gavin points out some basic criticisms of the administration's policies in Vietnam."

Then he says "as an alternative he urges the stopping of our bombing in North Vietnam."

I think you have clearly made it obvious that that is not your point, even though the editor reads that into your article.

"A halt in the escalation of the ground war," but no definitive procedure for getting that done has been worked out.

"Withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnamese coast," this is what he says.

Resolved by the Senate of the first extraordinary session of the 65th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the Arkansas General Assembly respectfully requests the Arkansas delegation in the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation now under consideration which would repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; be it

Resolved, That upon adoption hereof a copy of this resolution shall be furnished by the Secretary of the senate to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, now I should like to read from the letter which I wrote Mr. Becker. I read excerpts from it. I wrote:

As I recall, you were among a group of labor officials from Arkansas who visited me in my Washington office in January of last year at which time we discussed this repeal proposal. I advised you then that I could not vote for repeal and stated a number of reasons why I could not do so.

First of all, I do not believe in compulsory unionism or compulsory membership in any organization. I do not believe a workingman should be compelled to join a union in order to work or to retain a job; nor do I believe a worker should be denied a job or discharged from his employment because he is a member of a labor union. My concept of freedom is to permit the individual worker to make the choice—to decide for himself whether he wishes to join a union—and to be free from coercion or compulsion on the part of either the union or his employer in making that decision.

The constitutional amendment which the people of Arkansas adopted by ballot in 1944 guarantees those rights to the worker. The enabling statute which was later adopted, in effect, carries out the will of the people as expressed in that constitutional amendment. The resolution and those of your members who have written me requesting that I vote for repeal would have me vote to nullify the Arkansas constitutional provisions which our people adopted by ballot in a free election. I cannot do that. I do not think that I should be asked to do it.

In my letter to Mr. Becker, from which I have read excerpts, I stated succinctly the reasons and principles upon which I base my opposition to this proposal. There are many other reasons and factors that entered into my considerations, but those stated in my letter to Mr. Becker are wholly compelling and sufficient to sustain my position.

I thank the distinguished minority leader for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in respect of the President's reorganization plan of the Community Relations Organization, I am today introducing a resolution of disapproval and will seek hearings by the Committee on Government Operations.

I consider it wrong to transfer this agency to the Department of Justice, the prosecuting arm. It ought to go to an agency of the executive where mediation and conciliation can be practiced. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I shall seek early hearings on this proposal.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED—CLOTURE MOTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

There appeared in the Miami Herald on February 7, 1966, a very short editorial which bears the title "A Principle Goes to Jail." It reads as follows:

A PRINCIPLE GOES TO JAIL

The Senate debate on repealing the right-to-work provision of the Taft-Hartley Act has little significance for Levi Mews, a Milwaukee businessman. Wisconsin already has exercised its option and made the union shop compulsory.

But Mr. Mews can testify what it means when the right to work is lost.

One of his longtime workers refused on principle to join the union and Mr. Mews said he would respect the decision. The court said otherwise.

Because he didn't fire his employee forthwith, Mr. Mews was sentenced to jail for 30 days. The Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld the verdict last week

While Mr. Mews worries about who will mind his store while he serves his term, Senators debate putting all American employers under the same threat of prison if they insist on the right to work without paying tribute to a union. We hope Mr. Mews' plight will help them decide to preserve a basic freedom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the repeal of section 14(b) would erode the already restricted authority of the citizens of the States to legislate according to their expressed desires in this field.

It would represent the diminution of powers enjoyed by the States.

Not only would repeal nullify right-to-work laws which are now a part of the constitutional or statutory law of 19 States, but it would also deprive all of the 50 States of their regulatory power in this important area of labor-management relations. This would be particularly unwise at a time when we keep weakening and taking away the police powers of the States.

Adoption of repeal would mean that citizens could not legislate specific guarantees of economic and political freedom in the constitutions or statutes of their States.

The reservation of this right to the people of each State is in keeping with the principles of federalism set forth in our Constitution and proven by the passage of time.

One of the reasons why our constitutional system has survived so long, and one of the reasons why ours is the oldest written Constitution in force and effect in this world is because of the wisdom of the founders in devising this organic law, and because of the flexibility that is given to it by the dissemination of certain governmental powers among the States.

The economy of my State of Texas has fared extremely well in recent years under our right-to-work law, as compared with non-right-to-work States, as Texas has gained a great deal under its present system of permitting freedom of choice about union membership.

Labor and management have benefited in Texas. The economy of my State has expanded at a greater rate than the average of non-right-to-work States, and in an atmosphere of labor-management harmony.

By virtually every index of economic growth it can be shown that not only my State, but all right-to-work States, have fared better than non-right-to-work States.

Growth of union membership in right-to-work States has demonstrated that compulsory membership is not necessary for the continued good health of labor unions.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor and other nationally recognized reports show that right-to-work States lead the Nation in the rate of new jobs created in business and industry.

In the first quarter of 1965, the unions in Texas, a right-to-work State, won 43 of 56 National Labor Relations Board conducted representation elections for a win figure of 76 percent. This compares with a win figure of approximately 60 percent for the 2 previous years in Texas, and 57 percent over the entire Nation.

It can be seen that in our right-to-work State the unions have had greater success in organizing shops than they have in the non-right-to-work States.

Productivity and capital investment in an atmosphere of voluntarism create the most dynamic employment opportunities. Restrictions, whether by labor or Government policy, cause the employment opportunities to go elsewhere, as indeed they are doing these days.

Repeal of 14(b) would inevitably lead to heightened tensions and conflict throughout the land. Repealing a law strongly supported by a clear majority of the American people would create discord, not stability.

If we were to proceed with the consideration of H.R. 77 and to enact it into law we would create the most powerful monopoly that this country has ever seen. We would create a tremendous force acting with little restraint to influence the course of public affairs, and to influence the economy of this country. Should we create such a monopoly it would not be by popular demand of the people of the United States. It would be the result of the concerted

After reading your article, the average layman is likely to read into this exactly what the editor of Harper's read.

We get a lot of letters. I get a lot of letters from friends around the world saying, "General Gavin has got a very fine way of handling this thing without loss of life, sort of an operation fortress they call it or a holding operation."

Now I take it that that is not what you meant to say.

General GAVIN. That is absolutely——

Senator MUNDT. The editor of Harper's read it wrong. Is that right?

General GAVIN. Senator, this is not what I meant whatsoever. Senator SYMINGTON asked me about these points earlier. I might say furthermore in the Sunday issue of the New York Times magazine Harper's advertised, in this current issue of their magazine, with a lead, what appeared to be an article by Gen. James M. Gavin versus Johnson's strategy in Vietnam, and I wrote to them Monday, and I have the letter in front of me, and I said:

"I was shocked to see the advertisement in yesterday's book review section of the New York Times," and I was, because it misrepresents entirely my point of view.

I do not know how one controls that, but I would suggest that you bring the editor in here.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that General Gavin's letter to Harper's be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Harpers magazine, February 1966]

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM FROM GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

Last November our Secretary of Defense, while in Vietnam, finally gave battlefield approval to the concept of Sky Cavalry. Harper's should take some pride in the fact that it published my article, "Cavalry, and I Don't Mean Horses," in 1954. That was the genesis of the idea for this new form of mobility for our ground forces. It was to revolutionary for acceptance in the Pentagon then, and Harper's performed a public service in helping advance the idea.

I would like to comment about the Vietnam situation further. I should emphasize at the outset that I am writing solely from a military-technical point of view. I was Chief of Plans and Operations in the Department of the Army when Dienbienphu brought the French endeavors in Vietnam to an end. The Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi Delta. As I recall, we were talking about the possibility of sending 8 divisions plus 35 engineer battalions and other auxiliary units. We had one or two old china hands on the staff at the time and the more we studied the situation the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh. If we would be, in fact fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage. Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its war-making capacity. There, rather than in Southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all.

I should emphasize at the outset that there are philosophical and moral aspects of the war in southeast Asia that are understandably disturbing to every thoughtful person. My comments, however, are based entirely upon a tactical evaluation of our efforts there. At the time of the French defeat, it seemed to us military planners that if an effort were made by the United States to secure Vietnam from Chinese military exploitation, and that if force on the scale that we were talking about were to be employed, then the Chinese would very likely reopen the fighting in Korea.

At the time, General Ridgway thought it prudent to bring this situation directly to the attention of President Eisenhower, pointing out that we should be prepared for a large-scale war if we were to make the initial large-scale commitment to the Hanoi Delta that we were thinking about. I thought at the time that it took great moral courage for General Ridgway to take this action, but he has never been a man to lack such courage. The President decided not to make the commitment and in his book, "Mandate for Change," he commented that to have gone to war under those conditions would have been "like hitting the tail of the snake rather than the head," which is a good analogy.

Today we have sufficient force in South Vietnam to hold several enclaves on the coast, where sea and air power can be made fully effective. By enclaves I suggest Camranh Bay, Danang, and similar areas where American bases are being established. However, we are stretching these resources beyond reason in our endeavors to secure the entire country of South Vietnam from the Vietcong penetration. This situation, of course, is caused by the growing Vietcong strength.

The time has come, therefore, when we simply have to make up our mind what we want to do and then provide the resources necessary to do it. If our objective is to secure all of South Vietnam, then forces should be deployed on the 17th parallel and along the Cambodian border adequate to do this. In view of the nature of the terrain, it might be necessary to extend our defenses on the 17th parallel to the Mekong River, and across part of Thailand. Such a course would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam.

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the south. Also if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese "volunteers" and the reopening of the Korean front. This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on.

On the other hand, if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks in North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva, we could very likely do so with the forces now available. Maintaining such enclaves while an effort is being made to solve the internal situation in Vietnam, and in the face of the terroristic war that would be waged against them, poses some serious problems, and the retention of some of the enclaves may prove to be unwise; but the problems that we would then have to deal with would be far less serious than those associated with an expansion of the conflict.

I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki. The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand. But we should be realistic about the dangers of the course that we are now on. A straightforward escalation of our land power in southeast Asia to meet every land-based challenge, while at the same time we leave China and Cambodia immune from attack, poses some very forbidding prospects. I realize that our Secretary of State was recently quoted in the press as having said that "the idea of sanctuary is out." However, the initiative is not ours and there is an abundance of evidence now that both China and Cambodia are sanctuaries for Communist military strength that is used to support the Vietcong.

To get to the heart of the problem, I doubt that world opinion would tolerate the bombing and seizure of Manchuria. If the Chinese Communists continue on their present course of aggression and, at the same time continue to develop more devastating weapons—and I refer to nuclear weapons—the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet. In the meantime, we must do the best we can with the forces we have deployed to Vietnam, keeping in mind the true meaning of strategy in global affairs. Economics, science and technology, and world opinion will, in the long run, serve our strategic interests well if we handle our national resources wisely. On the other hand, tactical mistakes that are allowed to escalate at the initiative of an enemy could be disastrously costly. Since the advent of the Space Age, there has been a revolution in the nature of war and global conflict. The confrontation in Vietnam is the first test of our understanding of such change, or our lack of it. The measures that we now take in southeast Asia must stem from sagacity and thoughtfulness, and an awareness of the nature of strategy in this rapidly shrinking world.

Referring again to the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam, it is the kind of innovation that is generally unpopular in a conservative society, and in the military establishment of such a society. But many more innovations, both technical and in management methods, must be found if we are to continue to survive as a free people. Merely making bigger bombs or using more of them is not the answer. So I hope that Harper's will continue to support innovative methods when they are suggested, as you did when you first published the idea of sky cavalry in 1954.

When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an Army that I wanted it to be. I think it is that kind of an Army now, and I would be happy to serve in it in any grade in Vietnam or anywhere else. It is doing a splendid job in Vietnam and needs the support of all of our people.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act be accepted and printed in the RECORD as if fully given by me.

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

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, there have been few public debates infected with more political emotionalism than the one over whether section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed. In such emotionally charged debates,

basic issues are often obscured and relevant consequences are often distorted. The debate over 14(b) is no exception. All of us who have taken part in this debate have been guilty, at one time or another, of making sweeping generalizations and predications as to the effects of State right-to-work laws which are authorized by 14(b), and about the consequences that would be incurred with the repeal of 14(b).

Without attempting to present myself as a wholly detached and neutral observer I would like to review, as dispassionately as possible, the significant facts of the matter as I see them—the facts which I have drawn upon in deciding what position to take on the question of whether or not 14(b) should be repealed.

First it is absolutely necessary to get firmly in mind the legal meaning of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, what it does and does not do, and what its repeal would or would not mean.

Section 14(b) was included in the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 because Congress wanted to specifically spell out the fact that the individual States had the right to enact laws declaring that the right of persons to accept employment, if offered, shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union. In short, Congress wanted to make it very clear that the States could, if they so chose through their democratic majority rule processes of political debate and lawmaking, ban union security arrangements such as the union shop. In so acting Congress was not conferring upon the States a power that they did not previously possess. The historic Wagner Act of 1935, which labor leaders, with some justification, point to as the Magna Carta of the labor union movement, contained no provision aimed at precluding the States from legislating in this area. During the period from 1935 to 1947 four States did enact such laws. In 1947, seven more put right-to-work laws on their statutes. Since then, several other States have adopted such laws, some have repealed laws that they had earlier adopted, leaving 19 States in which right-to-work laws are currently in effect.

The State laws which declare the union shop to be illegal are generally called right-to-work laws. This designation is taken from the fact that where such laws are in force no worker can be denied the opportunity to work because he refuses to join a union. Because it is not commonly understood it needs to be pointed out that all right-to-work laws are impartial in their wording, protecting the rights of both union and nonunion employees. That is, they not only specify that workers shall not be denied a job because he prefers not to belong to a union, they also prohibit employers from denying employment to a worker simply because he belongs to a union. Right-to-work laws, of course, do not guarantee any worker a job. In that sense the terms is misleading.

On the other hand, the absence of right-to-work laws does not mean that all wage earners must belong to a union—a simple point, but one that is often overlooked in the heat of debate. It must be kept in mind that a union can be established only after a majority of the workers of a particular plant or business agree to establish a union. The elected representatives of the union can then bargain with management for a union security arrangement. A union shop is legally put into effect only after both labor and management have so agreed.

By the same token, the existence of right-to-work laws does not preclude the possibility that all workers in a particular plant or business will belong to a union. Right-to-work laws are in no way aimed at preventing any worker who wishes to join a union from doing so. They are aimed only at preventing union membership as a condition of employment. It is also necessary to note here that the existence of a right-to-work law does not in actual practice necessarily eliminate compulsory unionism. The promulgation of a law and its practical enforcement are two different things. Students of labor-management relations have long agreed that the Taft-Hartley Act's legal ban on the closed shop did not in fact eliminate such arrangements. The closed shop has been driven underground, but not out of existence. The same parallel often exists in regards to State laws banning the union shop and lesser forms of union security contracts.

It should also be kept in mind that national labor-management relations laws apply only to those business enterprises found to be in the flow of interstate commerce. Thus, repeal of 14(b) would in no way affect the status of right-to-work laws applicable to those enterprises of a purely intrastate nature, that is, the smaller and localized business concerns.

A great number of political observers have pictured the debate over 14(b) as a sociopolitical struggle involving the question of the acceptability of unions, their role in society and the political power they exercise.

Without question this element is involved. Most labor leaders see right-to-work laws as being antiunion both in intent and in effect. Of the individuals and groups who have campaigned for right-to-work laws and who oppose repeal of 14(b) there are those who implicitly agree with this view. They believe that unions have become, or are threatening to become, so economically and politically powerful as to endanger the public interest.

Due to the very nature of conflicting economic interest and the inevitable variations in ideological outlook, certain tensions between union interests and nonunion interests will always exist. These tensions have affected the debate over whether or not 14(b) should be repealed.

But, Mr. President, it is my sincere belief that this aspect of the debate has been blown out of all reasonable proportion, and in the process many of the significant factors and issues in this great question have been ignored, obscured, and distorted. Another result of this situation is that it has become increasingly difficult for any individual to participate in the debate without being categorized as either a rabid partisan or foe of labor. This is most unfortunate. Against the background of labor-management legislation of the past three decades and in the context of present social, economic, and political climate of this country there are few citizens and fewer political and public opinion leaders who are seriously opposed to unions as such. Thus, it is a considerable injustice to see the 14(b) debate as simply one of prounion against antiunion forces.

This is the age of big business, and regardless of where one's economic or ideological interests may lie, fairminded judgment recognizes that big labor is perhaps an inevitable, and on the whole, a proper counterdevelopment.

But precisely because of the existence of big labor and big business it is necessary at times for Government to intervene to the extent of establishing ground rules within which labor and business are to compete with each other so as to assure that this natural and inevitable struggle of economic interests be carried out in such a way as not to endanger the public interest.

Independent observers note that prior to the 1930's Government intervention in disputes between business and labor more often than not worked to the advantage of business. This situation was dramatically changed by the enactment of a series of national laws during the 1930's. Under the climate of New Deal legislation the power of organized labor was widely and dramatically expanded.

Since the end of World War II the Government has steered a more neutral course. Although this has varied somewhat between the various administrations and Congresses, the dominating theme of labor-management legislation in the postwar era has been the development of ground rules designed to assure the fair treatment of both business and labor, and particularly to protect and promote the overall public interest.

The Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 is symbolic of this approach. Whereas the Wagner Act of 1935 had spoken only of the rights of labor, the Taft-Hartley Act spelled out the rights of business and the obligations of labor, and also gave the National Government greater power to intervene in stalemated labor disputes where a work stoppage would be clearly against the national interest.

The establishment of labor-management ground rules by Congress always involves two types of questions. First, what types of ground rules shall be developed. Second, shall the ground rules be applied with national uniformity. Both of these questions always involve issues of much broader concern than the particular economic interests which are directly affected. They inevitably involve the larger questions of individual rights and freedoms, and the question of the basic governmental structure of this Nation and the nature of the political process by which public policy is made.

In many aspects of labor-management relations Congress quite properly had judged that in the best interests of labor, business, and the public as a whole,

the very same thing will hold true of all our veterans that we would make eligible under this bill to receive the benefits that a grateful nation can give to them.

This proposal does not constitute a handout. I think of it as part of the debt all of us should be willing to pay to those who serve their country in the military forces. As long as we continue to draft our Nation's youths, we should be willing to contribute to the well-being of these same youths.

June 22, 1966, will mark the 22d anniversary of the signing of the World War II GI bill. Since enactment, it has raised the educational level of the entire Nation through its various schooling and training provisions. A total of 7,800,000 World War II vets entered into training under this program.

In Alabama alone, nearly 231,000 out of the 346,000 Korea World War II veterans have been educated and trained under the GI bill.

The record shows that veterans have a higher income than nonveterans. This can be attributed in part to the beneficial effects of the GI educational program. Hundreds and thousands of World War II GI's who took advantage of this program are now leaders in their communities. They are respected citizens who are earning good incomes and who bear a large measure of responsibility for their community's growth and progress. These same GI's can now assist their younger brothers as a result of their success. Because of their higher incomes and resulting higher taxes, a measure such as this cold war GI bill can now be enacted and properly financed.

The original GI bill, which I was also pleased and honored to cosponsor, stimulated an unparalleled record of homeownership. In promoting homeownership that had been stimulated from previously enacted laws, this program has resulted in well over 6 million veterans being able to buy homes.

Mr. President, the battle between democracy and communism continues, even increases daily. To my way of thinking, education is a most critical weapon in that battle. Accordingly, I believe that the so-called cold war GI bill can play an extremely significant part in this battle. I am indeed happy to have had an opportunity to help promote this legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I was most gratified today to participate in passage of the cold war GI bill.

This legislation illustrates the recognition by Congress that those men and women who have served their country during the cold war—and sometimes hot wars—since 1955 have suffered the same disruption of their lives and careers as the veterans of other wars.

Passage of the bill was long overdue and I was proud to be a cosponsor of what I know will be regarded as landmark legislation.

But the man who deserves the highest recognition and commendation for his untiring efforts is the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

He has been the leader in this endeavor since 1959, and he has never wavered in his efforts, even in the face of some years of inaction.

The Senator has performed a great service and I salute his outstanding leadership and determination in pursuing and securing passage of this outstanding legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the House has improved the educational program in two changes by making it permanent and by making provision for active duty servicemen to further their education. But I fear that the House bill weakens the education program as compared to the Korean GI program by decreasing the duration of educational benefits possible for length of service, by eliminating on-the-job, on-the-farm, and apprenticeship training—although full entitlements for institutional vocational training are preserved—and particularly by reducing the monthly allowances paid while the veteran is obtaining his education. In 1952 when the Korean GI bill was passed, the reasonably monthly allowances set by Congress to cover the veterans subsistence, tuition and expenses were at the rates of $110 for a single veteran, $135 for a veteran with one dependent, and $160 for the veteran with two or more dependents.

Now 14 years later, after a gradual but substantial increase in the cost of living, and sharp increases in tuition charges, I see little justification for the House's action in cutting back the barely adequate Korean bill rates in the Senate-passed bill.

The House-passed rates of $100, $125, and $150 appear insufficient to accomplish the purpose of the bill, of encouraging veterans to continue their education after their period of service. I think it will not be many months before the need to improve this feature of the bill will be apparent.

One of the important features of the bill is that it carries forward provisions for the training of veterans in educational institutions other than colleges and universities. It recognizes the fact, which some educators wish to ignore, that a college degree is not the only type of education necessary in our society.

This bill also provides for education in a business school, technical institute, or similar postsecondary educational institution. I think it is most fortunate that this measure calls upon these types of postsecondary educational institutions to contribute to the readjustment education of our veterans. The business, trade, and technical schools are a very important part of our postsecondary educational system.

On the whole, this is a good bill. It follows the pattern of the Senate-passed bill and largely meets its objectives. The slight differences that are disappointing to me are yet not seriously crippling to the goal of providing a full program of educational and other readjustment benefits. I have no hesitancy in urging the Senate to adopt the language of the House-passed bill. There is relatively little in dispute that could possibly be gained by a conference with the House as compared to the benefit to be gained by enactment of this long-awaited act of justice in the shortest possible time.

No bill of this magnitude can attain passage without the help and cooperation of a great many people. I pay tribute to the members who have served on our Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee for their support and encouragement through the many hearings and meetings we have had on this bill. The cold war veterans who will benefit by this bill owe special thanks to the chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, LISTER HILL, who never failed to meet any request aimed at furthering its enactment. The supporters and cosponsors of the bill are to numerous to name, but I ask unanimous consent to list the cosponsors of S. 9 at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. RIBICOFF.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Many dedicated staff members have devoted many hours to work on this bill; particular recognition is due to Stuart McClure and Jack Forsythe of the Labor Committee staff, Charles M. Johnston and Fred Blackwell, former counsels of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, and Hugh Evans, assistant Senate legislative counsel, and to my legislative assistant, Richard Yarborough, Alan Mandel, Gene Godley, and to many others.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I extend the heartiest congratulations to the Senator from Texas. He has waged a long and successful fight on the legislation that has just been passed.

I am particularly pleased that a provision that the Senator from Texas and I and others introduced was incorporated in the bill so as to extend the benefits of direct loans on housing to veterans.

I am delighted that provision was included in the measure.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I also commend the Senator for the fact that he was one of the coauthors and leaders in the fight for the first GI bill of 1944. The Senator has consistently supported every measure to help GI's since his original authoring of the first GI bill. No bill of this magnitude can attain passage without the cooperation of many persons.

When this bill passed the Senate last year, it had the support of all members of the subcommittee, including Senators on both sides of the aisle. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], who was the ranking minority subcommittee member, supported the measure.

I extend my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He has

helped us through 7 long years and four different Congresses. His committee reported the bill every time under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama.

I pay special tribute also to the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], who is a member of the subcommittee, as is his brother, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The Senator from New York last year, by his incisive cross-examination, pointed out the weaknesses and fallacies of the opposition arguments. He tore each obstruction apart.

The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts spent more hours with me in hearings on the bill than did any other member of the committee.

I am grateful to all the supporters and coauthors of the bill, who are too numerous to mention. There are more than 40.

When the bill was reported last year, it had the support of every member of the committee, Democrats and Republicans alike. I am delighted that this 7-year fight has been concluded. In the course of this fight, the Senate has been the legislative body responsible for the passage of the bill. The Senate committee always reported the bill. The Senate as a body passed the measure every time it was presented. The measure always received support from both sides of the aisle. The other part of the coequal legislative branch and the administration held the measure up for 7 years. The Senate did not do so.

I thank all Members of the Senate because the Senate, as an institution, has been the only branch of the Government to keep alive the hopes of millions of veterans. For 7 long years, we have been receiving letters asking: "Is there any hope for the passage of this measure?" We have always replied that the Senate of the United States supports the bill and that there is hope.

I yield the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I join other Senators in commending my senior colleague for his long and successful leadership, and for his never-give-up attitude and the tremendous amount of work that he has put in on the GI bill.

The senior Senator from Texas has earned the approbation of the entire Senate and certainly of all men in the Armed Forces everywhere in the world. The senior Senator from Texas is responsible, more than any other person, for the passage of this measure. He deserves full credit for the Senate having enacted this important measure today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] upon the Senate's final action today on the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. The success was achieved through his indefatigable efforts in behalf of the veterans of this Nation in this and in many prior sessions of the Congress. His reputation as "Mr. Veteran" is richly deserved.

This action today represents a high mark in many long and arduous battles for veterans by the senior Senator from Texas. Veterans are indeed fortunate in having an advocate of his great skill and tireless devotion.

Tribute also should be accorded the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, he, too, demonstrated considerable devotion and great effort in behalf of this most recent GI bill. Our thanks to both of these distinguished Americans.

Finally, the Senate salutes all of the distinguished members of the subcommittee, including the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNDEY], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. Today's final action is attributable to their splendid assistance, effort, and cooperation.

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana obtained the floor.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT AND THE FOLLOWING WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m., Monday, February 14; and that, immediately after convening on that day, the Presiding Officer shall, without the transaction of any business or debate, declare the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, February 16.

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

VIETNAM CONSTRUCTION AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2791, the Vietnam construction and procurement authorization bill be made the pending business when reported today from the Senate Armed Services Committee.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no debate is anticipated on this measure today, but it will be the unfinished business at the conclusion of business today and debate thereon will commence next Wednesday, immediately after the completion of morning business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this would automatically withdraw the motion to consider H.R. 77.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the Senate adjourns, the motion dies.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD ASKS AND ANSWERS A PERTINENT QUESTION—POLICE BRUTALITY OR PUBLIC BRUTALITY?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, many statements have been made about police brutality—whether or not it exists and, if it does, to what extent. Our colleague, Senator BYRD of West Virginia, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, has long been interested in this subject.

An article by Senator BYRD, entitled "Police Brutality or Public Brutality?" appears in the February edition of the Police Chief, the official publication of the International Association of the Chiefs of Police.

Senator BYRD also was the principal speaker at a recent seminar at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va., on "Police Operation Versus Crimes of Robbery, Burglary and Auto Theft," sponsored by the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia in cooperation with the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia.

This seminar was attended by representatives of police departments in 17 major cities in the country including, New York, Boston, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, and others.

Because of the importance of this question, I believe it is well for Members of the Senate to read both the article and address by Senator BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Police Chief, February 1966]

POLICE BRUTALITY OR PUBLIC BRUTALITY?

(By Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, U.S. Senate)

(NOTE.—U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of Sophia, W. Va., began his political career in 1946 when he was elected to the West Virginia House of Delegates. After completing his second term in that office, he was elected to the West Virginia Senate in 1950 and to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1952, 1954, and 1956. In 1958 he was elected to the U.S. Senate and in 1964 he was reelected by the greatest vote ever accorded a West Virginia candidate. He is a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Armed Services Committee, and the Committee on Rules and Administration. He earned the LL.B. cum laude from American University.)

There is a great cry that the police of this Nation must hew to the letter of the law, whereas others who do not agree with it have the right to break the law with impunity.

Law enforcement in America is in trouble.

To me, this situation reflects that our entire country is in trouble, because when our law enforcers are weakened and made impotent, then the laws which govern our Nation are in danger of collapsing.

For any number of reasons and alleged lofty causes the men and women of the law enforcement establishment are being made ineffectual. Alarmingly, a long parade of individuals with odious tactics are straining the tolerance of our Constitution to the breaking point. At the same time, this

Adjustment Board, and to make all awards of such Board final; and

H.R. 12563. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 706. An act to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and to make all awards of such Board final; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 12563. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. METCALF:

Statement by him on national recognition being given to outstanding citizens of Montana, and tributes to Joe Carroll, assistant superintendent on the public school system of the District of Columbia; and to Catherine Nutterville, of VISTA.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Article dealing with the first statue dedicated to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, published in the Illinois Bar Journal.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Comments on Upward Appalachia luncheon in which members of West Virginia delegation in the Congress were guests of the Monongahela Power Co., and report of that company on activities which relate to the economic growth of West Virginia.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 194 of title 14, United States Code, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries appointed Mr. LENNON of North Carolina, Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GROVER of New York as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, 78th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries appointed Mr. DOWNING of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. MOSHER of Ohio as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1698) to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

OHIO STUDY SHOWS SCHOOL MILK NEEDED FOR ALL CHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been speaking daily on the floor of the Senate to protest the action of the Bureau of the Budget in withholding $3 million in appropriated funds from the special milk program for schoolchildren. The Federal share of the expenses of providing milk for schoolchildren has, as a consequence, been cut by 10 percent from last year's levels. The President's budget for fiscal 1967 indicates that the program is headed for virtual extinction. It would be cut from $103 to $21 million and redirected only to those children who can qualify as needy with some sort of a means test. None of this will save money because the CCC must buy under price support laws that the schoolchildren do not drink.

I invite the attention of Senators today to a pamphlet published by the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station entitled "Recommendations for More Effective School Milk Programs." On page 3 the pamphlet states, under the heading "Keep the Price Low":

> Without exception, studies show that one of the most important ways to get more children to drink more milk in schools is to keep the price as low as possible. This price will depend upon the amount the school pays for milk, the margin it takes to cover the expense incurred in handling and serving milk, and whether it receives partial reimbursement for that milk by participating in one or both of the Federal programs (school lunch and school milk).

Obviously the administration's attempts to slice school milk funds by 80 percent will make the price the child must pay high, resulting in a dropoff of milk drinking all the way from preschmoolers to high school seniors. This is evident from the pamphlet's statement that "research shows that average milk consumption per pupil is generally higher in schools that serve milk under the Federal programs than in schools that serve milk outside these programs."

Mr. President, I particularly emphasize the following advice given on page 5 of the pamphlet, under the heading "Having Milk Available":

> Studies have identicated that children drink more milk when they can obtain it at various times during the day. A minimum goal is to have milk available at least three times a day, at midmorning, at noon, and at midafternoon. Some schools report that large quantities of milk are drunk by children as they arrive or leave, especially by those who must walk or ride long distances to school.

This statement deserves serious consideration because the Department of Agriculture seems to hold the view that when milk is served at the noon meal as a part of the school lunch program, it is not needed in midmorning or midafternoon. I believe this assumption is one of the underpinnings of the move to cripple the program in fiscal 1967. All the evidence I have been able to gather indicates the school milk program will be curtailed only in those schools having a school lunch program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

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

VN

URGENT NEED FOR BIG INCREASE IN EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND FARM AID TO VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to ask for a prompt and vast stepup in educational, health, and agricultural assistance and land reform in South Vietnam.

In the last few years we have increased our Vietnam military effort more than a hundredfold.

We have often talked about the necessity for making a comparable economic, educational, and health effort; but we have done far less than we can do, than we should do, or—if we are going to have any chance to achieve our objectives—we have done far less than we must do.

Today we have less than one American in Vietnam working for all nonmilitary purposes combined for every 200 American soldiers and marines.

Today we spend $1 on schools, health, agricultural assistance, and land reform in Vietnam for every $400 we spend on military action.

Now listen to the words of Gen. Edward Lansdale, a distinguished American and a recognized expert on subversion and revolution:

> The harsh fact, and one which has given pause to every thoughtful American, is that, despite the use of overwhelming amounts of men, money and materiel, despite the quantity of well-meant American advice and despite the impressive statistics of casualties inflicted on the Vietcong, the Communist subversive insurgents have grown steadily stronger, in numbers and in size of units, and still retain the initiative to act at their will in the very areas of Vietnam where Vietnamese and American efforts have been most concentrated.

As Lansdale further said:

> The Communists have let loose a revolutionary idea in Vietnam. It will not die by being ignored, bombed, or smothered by us. Ideas do not die in such ways.

THE VIETCONG PITCH

What is that idea? There is not one, but three. They are powerful. And the

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 2857, my distinguished colleagues, Senator JAVITS and Senator BAYH, be included as sponsors of this bill, which would increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution. I believe I should say that both Senators indicated their desire to join in sponsoring this bill on Wednesday of this week, and according to the request I made when I introduced this legislation on February 1, the bill was to be at the desk through Wednesday, February 9. Through an error in notation, the bill was printed a day earlier than the request noted, so I want to be sure that the record is clear that the sponsors include Senator BAYH and Senator JAVITS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on the 19th of January, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 71. Some 53 Senators joined with me as cosponsors of the resolution. Since that date and since the printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, a number of other Senators have called asking to be listed as cosponsors. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that further printings of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71 include as cosponsors the following Members of the U.S. Senate:

LISTER HILL, GEORGE A. SMATHERS, GEORGE D. AIKEN, CARL T. CURTIS, PHILIP A. HART, GEORGE MCGOVERN, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, EDWARD V. LONG, JOHN O. PASTORE, WINSTON L. PROUTY, HARRY F. BYRD, CARL HAYDEN, JACOB JAVITS, GAYLORD NELSON, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, ALBERT GORE, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, WAYNE MORSE, RUSSELL B. LONG, LEE METCALF, GEORGE MURPHY, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, JOSEPH S. CLARK, RALPH YARBOROUGH, JENNINGS W. RANDOLPH, JOHN SPARKMAN, ROMAN L. HRUSKA, MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, MILTON R. YOUNG, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, B. EVERETT JORDAN, THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, THRUSTON MORTON, HERMAN TALMADGE, JOHN MCCLELLAN, NORRIS COTTON, CALEB BOGGS, and THOMAS DODD.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to my colleagues for this expression of support for the U.S. Olympic Committee in its selection of Utah as the nominee of the United States for the site of the 1972 winter Olympic games. When the International Olympic Committee meets in Rome, Italy, in April of this year, the U.S. delegation will be fortified in its bid for the winter Olympic games by this strong expression of support of the U.S. Senate.

I hope that our colleagues in the other body will act promptly and with equal unanimity to make the expression of the Congress complete that the United States urges the holding of the 1972 winter Olympic games in Utah.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 3, 1966, the names of Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MCCARTHY were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2872) to encourage private enterprise in the establishment and development of outdoor recreation areas and facilities for public use, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and other Senators) on February 3, 1966.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1522, TO REMOVE ARBITRARY LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN ATTORNEYS' FEES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on February 28, 1966, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will hold a hearing on S. 1522, a bill to remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the United States. This bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.

Numerous agencies of the Federal Government now impose limitations upon fees which attorneys may charge clients for services rendered in administrative proceedings. S. 1522 would abolish all these provisions of law or agency regulations, and would allow each administrative agency to pay attorney's fees in an amount equal to the reasonable value of the services rendered by the attorney concerned.

We hope to hear from all witnesses who are desirous of testifying on any aspect of S. 1522. Such persons who would like to testify should contact Mr. Benny L. Kass, assistant counsel to the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, room 3214, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225–5617.

NOTICE ON HEARINGS ON ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce that the hearings on electoral college which were to be held on February 7 through February 10 and were rescheduled for February 14 through 17 have necessarily been postponed.

Since the subcommittee does intend to consider this question at the earliest possible date, I suggest that interested persons or organizations who wish to be heard on this subject contact the subcommittee staff in room 419, Old Senate Office Building, phone extension 3018.

POPULATION HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, AT 10 A.M., IN ROOM 3302, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate will be in recess from the conclusion of business today until noon of Wednesday next, February 16, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures will continue hearings on S. 1676 on Wednesday, February 16. The public hearing will be held in room 3302 in the New Senate Office Building, starting at 10 a.m.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM J. LYNCH TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been rescheduled for Thursday, February 24, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William J. Lynch, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of Illinois, vice Michael L. Igoe, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, as chairman.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 10, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1698) to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. DE LA GARZA, of Texas, as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group, to fill the existing vacancy thereon, vice Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 706. An act to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad

Vietcong has suited their action to the triple pledge. Here they are:

"Land to the tiller."

In a nation teeming with landless tenant farmers, the Vietcong has given the tenant the local authority and the military power.

"The soldier helps the peasant."

The Vietcong soldier tortures and terrifies the peasant. He helps him—physically helps him—when the peasant cooperates.

"The government exists for the people."

This Vietcong slogan is given believability precisely because the Vietcong helps the landless tenant.

WEAPON NEEDED TO KILL VIETCONG IDEA

What is our answer?

We have an answer—a brilliantly proven answer.

We know how to make farms thrive as no people in history ever have before. And we know what the family-owned, family-operated farm means to a people's will to fight and sacrifice for their nation. We know how to make it work as a marvel of efficiency.

American medical achievements are the envy of the world.

In Medicare we have just given a great national example of how to put that medical know-how to work for millions.

American education is our real glory. And this President, this Congress has shown how we can advance education to bring the abundant life to all of our people.

Can this education, health, farm know-how help us in Vietnam? It can. It has.

Indeed, in Vietnam itself we have over the years a great and proud record of achievement through American assistance.

It is not a question of whether more educational, agricultural and health aid will work in Vietnam. We know it will.

Last March I spelled out the details of that great story on the floor of the Senate. Today I bring it up to date.

1965 AMERICAN CONTRIBUTION TO VIETNAM

Since last year, the 9 two-year trade schools financed by the United States have increased to 20, more than doubling this vital area's capacity.

Three million textbooks had been published a year ago. Today, the total stands at 6 million for elementary school use, 500,000 for secondary schools and 40,000 for university use.

American aid supplied five dredges to augment the eight at work last year in developing ports and harbors.

We completed a modern microwave telecommunications system. This links Saigon with the principal towns of the Mekong Delta provinces.

American medical know-how gave 83 percent of the population protection against malaria. The incidence rate rose, however, from .77 percent in 1962 to 1.57 percent because medical teams still are barred from some Vietcong-controlled areas.

We have helped build more than 45 bridges and culverts, over 400 miles of secondary roads, and almost 220 miles of major highways.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

The National Institute of Administration, built and staffed with American funds, now has 450 students training for administrative leadership in the Provinces. This is a 55-percent increase over last year.

We have increased the 21 Provincial training centers for village officials to 27. Five more are scheduled for completion by June 30 and another 12 are planned for the following year.

Eleven Provincial training centers now provide basic instruction and refresher training to all members of the national police.

VIETCONG HARASSMENT

The Vietcong have hindered the fresh water well project. In spite of this interference, we helped drill 208 more sanitary wells, bringing the total to 1,608. This particular program is geared for rapid expansion once conditions permit.

The rising number of refugees seeking haven in the cities of South Vietnam has gravely overtaxed the municipal water supplies. While awaiting the day when the countryside is stable enough for orderly development, most of the well drills are at work in many of the 65 cities of the south.

The Vietcong have also hit the electric power supply hard. Last May they sabotaged a 160-megawatt transmission line in Saigon from Danhim in central Vietnam.

As work was rushed on a 33-megawatt powerplant, financed through a $12.7 million U.S. loan, we helped the Public Works Ministry design, construct, and equip a 22-megawatt plant near Saigon.

In the countryside, we helped install diesel generating units in 32 towns and villages. The United States helped organize three rural electrification cooperatives and made plans to begin work on electrical projects early this year. We already have shipped the equipment for these projects.

Stronger transmitters and better broadcast facilities improved the 7-station Radio Vietnam network. We supplied 85,000 low-cost radios for the public and 11,000 for the armed forces and other groups.

These radios supplement 6,000 community listening centers already established, and almost 5,000 radios supplied through Australian and Japanese aid.

INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

The United States financed 8 new industrial plants and 51 expansions of existing plants in 1965. These projects represented more than $7 million in imported equipment.

Two teams of Vietnamese industrialists came to the United States and an American team went to Vietnam to explore investment possibilities. We opened up some 40 such possibilities as a result of these visits.

Some 70,000 jobs in textile manufacturing were made available because of plant expansion. These goods provide vital business and consumer income and meet 90 percent of South Vietnam's cotton textile requirements.

Between 1954 and 1961, America helped rebuild the country's transportation system almost completely. This included a mainline railroad from Saigon 700 miles north to the 17th parallel. parallel.

Rice production surpassed by 40 percent South Vietnam's prewar annual average output of 3.5 million metric tons.

American assistance helped build many small- and medium-sized factories. We doubled the hydroelectric power supply. We helped begin land reform.

I wish to comment on the extent to which we have started on these programs, how they have been interrupted, and how the programs in all cases have shown that they work, that they work out well, that it is possible, even in a country at war, even in a country suffering the instability and the many difficulties that Vietnam does suffer, it is possible to make these investments productively, but that we have not begun to do nearly enough.

As I say, we helped begin land reform. The South Vietnam Government, with American assistance, authorized almost 300,000 peasant families to receive title to land or to homestead on abandoned land.

We spent more than $2.1 billion on economic assistance between 1954 and 1964.

REAL GOAL OF VIETCONG ATTACK

It was exactly this progress toward orderly, stable development that the Vietcong had to stop. Ho Chi Minh as well as Mao Tse-tung must have known that progress like this would make a Communist South Vietnam impossible.

So along this road to orderly development, the Vietcong stepped up their attacks and subversion.

Prof. Wesley R. Fishel is certainly one of the leading American experts on Vietnam. He has spent many years in the country. He has written a brilliant, scholarly analysis of our aid program in current history.

Fishel, incidentally, served as adviser to the Prime Minister of Vietnam in 1955 and chief adviser to Michigan State University's Vietnam project in Saigon from 1956 to 1958. Fishel reports that the emphasis of our aid program changed in 1958.

At that time we replaced economic assistance with counterinsurgency programs designed to support the war directly in rural areas. U.S. dollars went to commodity imports instead of public works, education, and public health.

Professor Fishel wrote last fall:

> A smaller percentage of American aid went into purely technical assistance, intended to create the human and institutional resources needed to sustain Vietnamese freedom through the training of Government workers in the fields of education, health, public administration, public works, and the like.

The military struggle claimed among its victims the impressive gains made in the mid-1950's, a promising social welfare program, especially in education.

Civic action or self-help projects were undertaken but Communist insurgency

grew so active that, as Professor Fishel said:

By the spring of 1965, less than 50 percent of the Vietnamese countryside was generally available for aid operations, and in many areas token assistance at best was all that could be undertaken.

By 1965, the emphasis was once more on measures of an emergency nature. Survival once more became the primary objective.

Fundamentally, it is now accepted doctrine that elementary social justice is an element that has frequently been lacking in Vietnam, and that this gap must somehow be repaired.

At the same time, the dynamic political activity that is necessary to the achievement of social justice requires corollary economic and social assistance. But if any or all of these measures are to be effective or sustained, there must be continuing physical security against the Vietcong.

The vicious circle is a continuing dilemma for U.S. officials as well as for the Vietnamese themselves. Yet without some resolution of this dilemma, a successful outcome to the struggle in Vietnam is hard to visualize.

NEEDED: MONEY WHERE MOUTH IS

We have not yet resolved this dilemma.

President Johnson said only a few days ago:

We must make it clear to friend and foe alike that we are as determined to support the peaceful growth of southeast Asia as we are to resist those who would conquer and subjugate it.

In discussing his plans for American foreign aid, the President also said:

Our response must be bold and daring. It must go to the root causes of misery and unrest. It must build a firm foundation for progress, security, and peace.

I admire the President's words. I applaud him.

But last year, we had only 700 Americans working with the nonmilitary assistance program in South Vietnam. This year there are only 100 more.

As I have said, we have less than 1 American working for AID in the entire nonmilitary effort in Vietnam for every 200 American soldiers.

The total proposed American aid for schools, health and agricultural development in Vietnam for all three is only $31.7 million. We will spend 400 times as much in the strictly military effort in Vietnam.

I am not one of those who believe that we can do without military force. We must have it. It is essential. In fact, I support it without reservation. But I should like to add two things: First, we should keep in mind that our military effort has a single purpose, and that is to achieve negotiations in order to bring a just peace to this troubled nation. Any time our military effort can be interrupted or limited because it might possibly give rise to negotiations—we should certainly do so.

In the second place, it seems to me that all the firepower in the world cannot kill the idea that the Communists are on the side of the landless peasant.

And yet we do have the weapon that can destroy that basic source of Communist strength in Vietnam. We have the ability to improve the lot of the Vietnam little man swiftly and decisively.

Between 1955 and 1964 we helped increase the school attendance in Souh Vietnam from 300,000 to more than 1,500,000, an amazingly heartening achievement. I do not believe that there is a country in the world which has had a fivefold increase in school attendance in 10 years, whether in peace or in war. In South Vietnam it has been done under most difficult circumstances with American assistance.

But this year we plan to devote only $5.3 million to Vietnam schools.

The ratio of population to doctors in Vietnam is several hundred times what it is in America. Where we have brought our marvelous medical capacity to bear in Vietnam—for example, to counteract malaria—it has been a smashing success.

Yet this year we plan only $20.5 million for public health in Vietnam, which is substantially less, as I calculate it, than what we spend in one day in our military effort.

URGENT NEED FOR LAND REFORM

Most conspicuous of all, we have permitted the Vietcong to win the support of the majority of peasants who are landless with the Vietcong theme: "Land to the Tiller."

Only the landless are given miliary and local governmental authority by the Vietcong.

And in these tenant farmer areas, American military and civilian observers agree there are more Vietcong today than there were a year ago.

Why? Because too often we have permitted ourselves to be identified with South Vietnamese policy that has done just the opposite: give the power and authority strictly to the landlord.

The Ky government has modest land reform plans. But they are strictly limited and inadequately financed.

Best estimates are that an approximately $200 million program of buying some 2 million acres of Mekong Delta land would permit a 5- to 7-acre per-farm-family redistribution to landless peasants.

Similar attempts by the Diem regime foundered on a patently inadequate financing program.

The $200-million program I am suggesting represents a costly investment but in comparison with the military effort it would equal the cost of just 1 week of the Vietnamese military effort.

It could have a dramatic effect on the attitude of Vietnamese farmers who are now caught between the Vietcong and bloodsucking landlords, many of whom charge double the legal rents.

In Long An Province, one of South Vietnam's most fertile districts, more than 85 percent of the peasants are tenant farmers.

This Mekong Delta province was considered a showcase project of a combined Vietnamese and American miiltary and economic pacification effort to defeat Communist subversion.

Long An's tenant farmers heard "Land to the Tiller" often from the Vietong. What is more, the Vietcong show they mean what they say. They have directly alined themselves with the landless.

What has been the countermove of the South Vietnamese Government? Appeals—until recently—were almost exclusively to the 15-percent landlord class. These are the same people who occupy virtually every position of authority and power in the army and in local government.

The 85 percent landless have been practically ignored.

LAND REFORM: A BARGAIN OPPORTUNITY

We are spending $250 million a week on the military effort in South Vietnam. From 1961 to 1965 nothing was spent for land reform.

For the current fiscal year, $1.1 million was allocated for land reform. For all agricultural purposes, we are spending only $5.9 million.

An investment of $200 million in land reform would undermine the Vietcong's peasant support in the Mekong Delta.

Only 260,000 farms out of 1.2 million in the delta are owner operated. The rest are operated by the tenants who do not own the land. More than 500,000 are rented and 330,000 more are partly rented. Some 3,000 rich families in Saigon are the big landlords.

Long An Province, according to an official U.S. survey made last July, has 65 rich landlords, 3,000 farmer-owners and 28,000 tenant farmers.

What a bloodless victory awaits a really vigorous and adequate land reform program on our part.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that the military effort in Vietnam is a tragic but, in my judgment, essential action. Without military security against the Vietcong, the best social program in the world can make little progress.

Indeed, the fact that the Vietcong control half the countryside obviously slows down schools, health, land reform or any other action until the Vietcong are driven out.

But how many times do we have to learn the lesson in Vietnam that military conquest evaporates and blows away, if the mind and the heart of the peasant and villager are on the side of the Communists? Again and again the Vietcong are welcomed back in when the successful South Vietnam and American troops move on.

When we do win a rural area, we need to be prepared to do a far more ambitious job of schooling, health and land reform than the $1 we are spending for these purposes for each $400 we spend to do the essential military job.

The President has wisely acknowledged that we should spend more on education, more on health, and more on agricultural assistance in our foreign aid program and less on large capital investment. And yet in this most crucial of areas—Vietnam—we are making a pitifully inadequate effort to do just that. If we are to win the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people, we must do better—and I mean far better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these important documents:

First. A brilliant analysis of the history of American aid to Vietnam during the past decade. It was written for Current History by Prof. Wesley R. Fishel, a former adviser to the Prime Minister of Vietnam and former chief adviser to Michigan State University's Vietnam project in Saigon. Professor Fishel speaks with authority and his credentials to do so are without question.

Second. A thoughtful and penetrating, but apparently little-noticed, discussion of Vietnam and revolution by retired Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale. General Lansdale, once again a member of the U.S. mission in Vietnam, is our country's leading expert on counterinsurgency. His views, written for Foreign Affairs, deserve the consideration of everyone concerned with our role in southeast Asia.

Third. Detailed analyses of the pacification program and nonmilitary effort in Vietnam by two veteran New York Times reporters, Charles Mohr and R. W. Apple, Jr. Both speak with the authority and clarity of on-the-scene observers.

Fourth. A thought-provoking account of the need for land reform in Vietnam written by Richard Critchfield, the informed and articulate Asia correspondent of the Washington Evening Star.

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

[From Current History Nov. 1965]

AMERICAN AID TO VIETNAM

(By Wesley R. Fishel, professor of political science, Michigan State University)

(Wesley R. Fishel was an adviser to the prime minister of Vietnam in 1955, and chief adviser to Michigan State University's Vietnam project in Saigon in 1956–58. In 1961–62, he was a Guggenheim Fellow. From 1952 to 1956, Mr. Fishel was a consultant to the Foreign Operations Administration. He is the editor of "Problems of Freedom: Vietnam" (New York: Macmillan, 1961) and author of other works on Asia.)

NOTE.—Because of "Communist subversion of the South Vietnamese Government," as this author sees it, "By 1965, the emphasis [in United States foreign aid] was once more on measures of an emergency nature." Once more, economic development is not so important as measures of an emergency nature aimed at survival for South Vietnam. In the words of this specialist, "* * * American aid appears * * * to have come full circle."

In the strictest sense, American aid to Vietnam might be said to be in its 16th year. For it was in May 1950, that the Griffin Mission was dispatched to the Associated States of Indochina, recommended assistance to the French in their war against the Communist-led Viet Minh, and prepared the way for the expenditure of our first $44 million in aid money to that area. Now, a full 15 years and $5 billion later, the American aid program in Vietnam has become this country's largest and most critical involvement of its type in the world.

Foreign aid is an instrument of foreign policy. This simple fact has been at the core of many controversies and misunderstandings concerning the United States aid program. For in its initiation and its implementation since the early days of the Marshall plan in 1947, foreign aid has been seen variously by different people as an act of humanity, a measure of reconstruction, or an instrument of national interest.[1]

In the case of Vietnam, it has been all of these. Begun initially in 1950 with funds left over from the huge postwar program of assistance to Nationalist China, American aid has carried the complexion of humanitarian relief in that much of it was given for immediate assistance to people suffering from the ravages of war. At the same time, since it was given through the French rulers of the three colonial territories of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, and included a significant measure of military support, it also partook of a quality of national interest and was clearly related to United States foreign policy as a whole. For this was the period in which open conflict with Communist states began. On June 25, 1950, Communist North Korea had invaded the Republic of Korea to its south, and American armed forces, acting in the name of the United Nations, had come to the defense of the South Koreans.

Even as the fighting mounted in South Korea, the United States was aware that along the frontiers of North Vietnam, mainly in the Province of Yunnan, some 250,000 Chinese Communist troops were stationed and (it was then feared) poised for imminent attack toward the south. Although the threatened invasion never occurred, Communist China did lend important assistance to the Viet Minh forces in Indochina, with major shipments of material and substantial technical assistance as well. The United States, whose interest in the French colonies of Indochina had at first been of purely secondary character and had leaned toward support for the anticolonial nationalists fighting under Communist leadership in the Viet Minh, shifted sharply to full military and economic assistance to the French. For while American policymakers had severe misgivings about the purity of French motives and considered that the only real solution to the conflict in Indochina lay in granting independence to its subject peoples, the presence of Communist power on Vietnam's northern frontiers loomed ominously in their minds and came finally to dominate their thinking and their planning.

By 1953, what had begun in a haphazard fashion and without plan 4 years earlier had become a major and costly program of military assistance and economic aid. In its Activity Report for 1951–53, the Special Technical and Economic Mission to the Associated States of Indochina stated the United States purpose for being there as stemming from the fact that Indochina constituted "the key to all of free Asia." It then continued:

"It is in the interest of the United States to prevent by all available means these states from falling to the Communist bloc, since defeat here would foreshadow defeat in surrounding areas and undoubtedly engender the loss of southeast Asia. In such eventuality, it is probable that all of Asia would succumb." [2]

One may discern in this statement an early and simplistic rendering of the "falling domino" concept, later enunciated publicly by President Dwight Eisenhower. The report continued, however, with a second paragraph which is especially striking given the problems and solutions which have regularly been discussed since that day.

"The tremendous struggle in Indochina has been going on for more than 6 years. It is becoming increasingly apparent that, in order to achieve a decision, it will be necessary not only to strengthen the military effort of the Associated States and the French, but further to develop in the Indochinese peoples the will to fight and to support their governments. Thus the problem is not purely a military problem. The solution is not purely a military solution. What is needed here is simultaneous military, political, and economic action."

To this end, STEM saw its responsibility in five areas:

1. To increase government effectiveness and broaden popular support;
2. To help create a political, economic and social atmosphere which would "appeal to the individual and fire his self-interest in support of his government";
3. To assist military action by economic support;
4. To increase production, particularly in agriculture;
5. To maintain supplies by bringing in items for which foreign exchange was short.

The major difficulty, however, lay in the fact that France, while desiring American aid, did not wish partnership. Thus, the United States accepted a contributory role in a French colonial war (with whose objectives it was scarcely in sympathy) to prevent the achievement of Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian national independence, but did not at any point prior to the final defeat of French arms secure even a minimum voice in deciding how that war should be fought or might be won.

GENEVA, 1954

By the time that the conference of great powers met at Geneva in April 1954, it was painfully clear to all that France had to all intents and purposes lost the war and was seeking a way out. The Geneva agreements of July 20–21, 1954, brought a temporary cessation of hostilities to the war-torn lands of Indochina and terminated 90 years of French domination of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. The legal achievement of independence for these peoples did not come, however, until December 1954, when France formally conceded that status to them.

The U.S. position in the Geneva negotiations was at best equivocal. Participating, yet firmly determined not to agree to a "Munich" type of agreement, the American delegation refrained at the close of the conference from signing the accords. U.S. policy at this time was twofold; to deny control of southeast Asia in general and of South Vietnam in particular to the Communist world, and to attempt to develop a viable and friendly government in that part of Vietnam which remained attached to the free world. The area was considered then, as now, to be one of vital interest and major importance to the United States, and while the United States had no specific formal commitments to Vietnam at that time which bound it to the defense of Vietnam's political or territorial integrity, there were a number of explicit and implicit American commitments which bore upon this assumption of responsibility and consequent involvement. In addition, the United States had made a major financial contribution to the French prosecution of the war in Vietnam ($4.2 billion) between 1950 and 1954, and was loathe to see this stake lost unless the situation were indeed irretrievable—which American policymakers were reluctant to concede.

A NEW ADMINISTRATION

With the close of the Geneva Conference, a new administration in Saigon, under Catholic nationalist Ngo Dinh Diem, faced a galaxy of seemingly insoluble problems: housing, feeding, clothing and rendering self-sustaining some 860,000 refugees from the

[1] A useful symposium on the "why" of overseas assistance is Robert A. Goldwin's (ed.), "Why Foreign Aid" (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1962).

[2] Special Technical and Economic Mission to Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam (STEM), "Cumulative Activity Report to June 30, 1953" (Saigon, 1953), p. 6.

Communist areas in the north; governing with a bureaucracy that had been virtually paralyzed by the confusion and chaos of 8 years of civil war; reasserting central government authority over vast stretches of territory which had been ruled for years by the Communists or which were even at that moment under the sway of the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao sects; coping with the problems of economic dislocation resulting from the wartime flight from the southern countryside to the cities of more than one million peasant families; reorganizing the national army and provincial defense forces, which had been defeated along with the French; finding funds (at a time when the national income had virtually disappeared) so that governmental programs could go forward and services be brought to the population. The tasks were enormous, and the means at hand were slight.

With the end of French colonial rule, the Vietnamese turned to the United States for both aid and support. STEM, which had worked modestly and cautiously through the French, was at this point transformed into a large U.S. operations mission (the designation for aid missions representing the Foreign Operations Administration of the U.S. Government), and after January 1, 1955, it dealt directly with the Vietnamese. French influence over Vietnamese affairs diminished thereafter, and American responsibility began to assume substantial dimensions.

GOAL: SURVIVAL

Given the absence of technical, financial, and military wherewithal on the part of the Vietnamese, the mere act of survival became an objective. More than that, survival was a major challenge to the combined resources of the new regime in Saigon and to its American ally, as well as a vital prerequisite to any program of development which might be contemplated. American aid thus became a primary instrument in South Vietnam's struggle for survival, filling as it did the vast gap between the Vietnamese Government's capacities and its needs.

Apart from assistance in the restoration of internal security, through technical, financial, and economic support of the Vietnamese National Army and the national police and security services, which has at all times been the largest component of American aid programs in South Vietnam, the major preoccupation of the United States during the early days of the Diem period was the reception and resettlement of the refugees from Communist North Vietnam. Skilled advice and financial assistance was proffered and accepted gratefully by the Vietmanese Government, which thus was enabled to plan and program effectively for the resettlement of refugee families in hundreds of new villages across South and Central Vietnam, to aid them in the construction of new homes and villages, and to find gainful employment or otherwise develop self-sustaining economic programs. The Vietnamese Government at this time organized its refugee programs under a Commissariat General for Refugees, bringing together under one coordinator all administrative operations of a relevant nature.

This temporary administrative agency became a model of efficiency in a generally apathetic and tradition-bound bureaucracy. The handling of the refugees, furthermore, gave a psychological shot in the arm to the Vietnamese Government, and many observers consider that it was the stimulus needed to keep the Government alive and to enable it to begin treating more routine kinds of problems with effectiveness.

The accomplishment of Vietnam independence from France was one of Ngo Dinh Diem's first acts. A slow and complex process, this involved transferring military, legal, economic, and monetary authority from the French to the Vietnamese and was completed in December 1954. Nonetheless, financial independence was not matched in the military sphere until April 1956. France continued to subsidize the private armies of Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and Binh Xuyen (then opposing the Saigon government) until March 1955, and the French High Command in Vietnam continued to operate until a year after that.

With independence came new problems, some of emergency character, some of more lasting nature and import. Most were dealt with on an ad hoc basis during those early years, for the United States at that time still had no expectation that it was going to be involved in the little southeast Asian republic over a period of many years. Planning was not a concept that was then acceptable to the Foreign Operations Administration (nor its successor agency, the International Cooperation Administration). Such industrial growth as did occur resulted from occasional spurts of initiative, prompted by recognition of the fact that an independent Vietnam had different economic and industrial needs and problems than had been the case when the land was a colonial possession of France.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Some noteworthy economic steps were, however, taken between 1954 and 1961, principally through American aid cooperation. The transportation system, for example, was almost entirely rebuilt, including a main railway line running 700 miles north from Saigon to the demarcation line at the 17th parallel, and a reconstructed highway network. Rice production was stimulated to the point that South Vietnam exceeded by 40 percent its prewar annual average production of 3.5 million metric tons of paddy. Rubber production exceeded prewar totals. A number of small- and medium-sized manufacturing plants were built, forming a modest base for planned industrial growth and bringing into the Vietnamese economy a mixed cluster of Vietnamese and foreign investors linked in their enterprises by participating Vietnamese Government capital. An extensive agrarian reform program was undertaken by the Vietnamese Government, which ultimately resulted in nearly 300,000 peasant families receiving titles to land or being authorized to homestead on abandoned land. Japanese reparations provided a large hydroelectric plant on the Ca Nhim River in South-Central Vietnam, which has more than doubled Vietnam's electric power capacity.

SOCIAL WELFARE

Social welfare, too, received a substantial share of American aid attention. Teacher-training was a fundamental area of Vietnamese-American cooperation, as was the building of classrooms, with the result that between 1954 and 1961, school enrollments increased from about 400,000 to nearly 1,500,000, while the number of primary schoolteachers was increased from 30,000 to nearly 90,000. Public health measures involved the establishment of more than 12,500 village and hamlet aid stations and maternity clinics throughout the country, and a malaria eradication program which sprayed systematically and repeatedly more than 2 million homes and succeeded in bringing down the incidence of this endemic disabler from 7.22 percent in 1958 to 0.77 percent in 1962.

Over the years, as American aid committed more than $2.1 billion in economic assistance to Vietnam between 1954 and 1964, the number of American personnel in the country steadily increased until, by 1965, there were nearly 700 aid personnel directly employed in Vietnam. "Economic assistance" ceased to be the principal category of aid, after the resurgence of Communist subversive warfare after 1958. In its place, counterinsurgency assistance programs were formulated, to support directly the war and security efforts of the Vietnamese in rural areas. And commercial import programs, which provide funds for the purchase of essential commodities such as medicine, machinery, trucks, steel, fertilizer, and cement, played a major role. A smaller percentage of American aid went into purely technical assistance, intended to create the human and institutional resources needed to sustain Vietnamese freedom through the training of government workers in the fields of education, health, public administration, public works, and the like.

The much discussed and criticized strategic hamlet program (renamed the new life hamlet program after the overthrow of the Diem government in November 1963) was a principal focus of American technical assistance from 1962 on. Communist insurgency had created acute conditions of insecurity in the countryside of South Vietnam, and a program was organized to create as many as 11,000 defended hamlets for protection of the peasantry. Unfortunately, it was overzealously and clumsily administered by the Diem government, and ultimately failed to achieve its purpose.

It was in this context, however, that American aid first began to be delivered to the Vietnamese peasantry without passing in all cases through the intervening Vietnamese Government hierarchy. Carefully planned projects were developed between Vietnamese and American authorities for integrated pacification efforts, involving security activities, administrative arrangements, psychological efforts, and economic and social programs. Civic action (self-help) programs were undertaken on a large scale. Yet so great was the strain imposed by growing Communist-directed insurgency, and so intrinsically weak was the central Veitnamese Government, that advisers representing American aid programs in the rural provinces found during 1963 and 1964 that their geographical horizons of activity were becoming increasingly restricted. By the spring of 1965, less than 50 percent of the Vietnamese countryside was generally available for aid operations, and in many areas token assistance at best was all that could be undertaken.

Disastrous floods in central Vietnam in the autumn of 1964 brought tens of thousands of peasants into the cities and towns of central Vietnam seeking refuge. This influx coincided with and was followed by an even larger movement of humanity. In the presence of ever-intensifying Vietcong terrorism, and the concomitant trauma of war, nearly 600,000 peasants and their families fled villages and isolated hamlets in the hinterlands, and sought shelter and help in the cities and towns of the central Vietnam plain. This second major mass uprooting of Vietnamese peasantry has brought grave political, administrative, economic, and social problems to the Government of Vietnam. It offers a major challenge to that Government and its American ally which, if succesfully dealt with, could redound to the credit of Saigon, but which is also fraught with the most serious of consequences in the event that it is not dealt with effectively.

Although long-range economic planning had never been a significant feature of the American aid effort in Vietnam, after the Diem regime had consolidated its control in 1956 some thought was given to the problems of economic development. It was understood that Vietnam's agricultural base was, by Vietnamese and American agreement, a priority area for systematic development. A number of new crops, including kenaf and jute fibers, were introduced and added a degree of supporting sustenance. Some 700 factories of varying sizes were established. Improved municipal water systems and a number of thermal- and diesel-powered electric installations were provided. And in all, an encouraging start was made

on the development of what would become, hopefully, a viable economy.

This promising start, however, was rendered virtually meaningless by the onset of the Vietnamese Communist subversion of the South Vietnamese Government. By 1965, the emphasis was once more on measures of an emergency nature. Survival once more became the primary objective. Restoring Government services, which had been terminated because of insecurity and war hazards, was once more a high priority target. And American aid appeared at the time this article was written to have come full circle. An enormous augmentation in American military strength in Vietnam (from approximately 700 advisory personnel in 1960 to more than 130,000 advisory and combat troops by September 1965) has changed the nature of the war in that country and the character of the aid effort.

The war in Vietnam is now clearly understood to be an essentially political struggle in which the support of the people is a principal objective for both sides. Consequently, aid to the peasantry has become a prime element in the U.S. approach. The deterioration of the military situation during the years from 1960 to early 1965 brought serious reverses, loss of territory, and persistent political instability which prevented the attainment of many physical and political objectives of American aid. Although the military side of the war occupied much of the attention of United States and Vietnamese officials dring this period recognition of the political lacunae in the struggle caused increasingly vigorous efforts by aid officials in particular to achieve a satisfactory balance between military, economic, social, and political measures.

Fundamentally, it is now accepted doctrine that elementary social justice is an element that has frequently been lacking in Vietnam, and that this gap must somehow be repaired. At the same time, the dynamic political activity that is necessary to the achievement of social justice requires corollary economic and social assistance. But if any or all of these measures are to be effective or sustained, there must be continuing physical security against the Vietcong. The vicious circle is a continuing dilemma for U.S. officials as well as for the Vietnamese themselves. Yet without some resolution of this dilemma, a successful outcome to the struggle in Vietnam is hard to visualize.

[From Foreign Affairs, October 1964]

VIETNAM: DO WE UNDERSTAND REVOLUTION?

(By Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale)

Whatever course the long struggle in Vietnam finally takes, short of nuclear holocaust, one thing seems certain: the people of Vietnam still will be there. This is a reminder that war in Vietnam is a "people's war." As such, it is a constantly recurring phenomenon of this period of man's history. How it is fought and what happens to the Vietnamese people as a result have meanings, therefore, far beyond today or the boundaries of Vietnam itself. "People's wars" elsewhere will also make demands on the American people to help solve them. Thus, although the hour is late in Vietnam, terribly so, there is time yet for Americans to consider the war in Vietnam in its "people" nature, especially as regards what American assistance in these critical months will come to mean to the Vietnamese people in their own future, and to us in ours.

Nearly 4 years ago now, on December 20, 1960, the Communists set up the political base with which they hoped to win Vietnam by revolutionary struggle. The base consisted of an idea and of an organization to start giving that idea reality. Both the idea and the concept of the organization were foreign, having traveled the distance in time and space from Lenin in the Soviet Union via Mao in China.

The Communist idea was to gain control of the 14 million people living in South Vietnam by destroying their faith in their own government and creating faith in the inevitability of a Communist takeover. The organization to do this through a phased series of disciplined actions was called the "National Liberation Front of South Vietnam." It had a central committee to direct its operations for political-psychological-military actions, and a wide assortment of member "fronts" manned by small cadres, to appeal politically to mass groupings of Vietnamese people: the farmers, the workers, the youth, the intellectuals, and even the civil servants and military.

Ever since the creation of a Communist political base in Vietnam, the successive governments of Vietnam and their supporters and counselor, the United States, with the approval and sometimes the help of other free-world peoples, have given their substance and made their sacrifices to prevent a Communist win. The harsh fact, and one which has given pause to every thoughful American, is that, despite the use of overwhelming amounts of men, money, and materiel, despite the quantity of well-meant American advice and despite the impressive statistics of casualties inflicted on the Vietcong, the Communist subversive insurgents have grown steadily stronger, in numbers and in size of units, and still retain the initiative to act at their will in the very areas of Vietnam where Vietnamese and American efforts have been most concentrated.

Most American reactions to this stark fact have fallen within three general categories. Some believe that we should disengage in Vietnam, preferably by setting up means to end the struggle and bloodshed through international accommodation. Some believe we should plainly identify the struggle as a war and make use of our military proficiency to force the Communist regime in Hanoi to cease its adventure in the south. Some believe we should continue along the present course, but greatly increasing the quantity and effectiveness of what is done so that it eventually smothers and kills the Communist insurgency. The anomaly in these reactions is that each falls short of understanding that the Communists have let loose a revolutionary idea in Vietnam and that it will not die by being ignored, bombed, or smothered by us. Ideas do not die in such ways.

A fourth belief, admittedly in a minority in the free world at present, is to oppose the Communist idea with a better idea and to do so on the battleground itself, in a way that would permit the people, who are the main feature of that battleground, to make their own choice. A political base would be established. The first step would be to state political goals, founded on principles cherished by freemen, which the Vietnamese share; the second would be an aggressive commitment of organizations and resources to start the Vietnamese moving realistically toward those political goals. In essence, this is revolutionary warfare, the spirit of the British Magna Carta, the French "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité" and our own Declaration of Independence.

For American consideration, this fourth belief might be put another way. It is this. In trying to help the Vietnamese, the United States has been contributing in generous measure those things which it so far has felt most qualified to give and which the Vietnamese may lack—money, equipment, and technical advice. In general, though, the United States has felt inhibited about trying to make a contribution in areas in which it feels that the chief responsibility must rest with the Vietnamese themselves, particularly in finding the motivation for conducting a successful counterinsurgency effort. The thesis of this paper is that, due to the extent of our involvement, and because everything depends on that motivation, Americans cannot escape responsibility in this area either.

It will be stanchly maintained by some that no nation can endow another nation with the will to be free, that only an indigenous movement can have genuine popular appeal, that Americans should not interfere in the domestic affairs of another nation, and that the Vietnamese war is now in such a state that political innovations could invite disaster. This makes it necessary to examine the revolutionary solution in some detail.

Two near neighbors of Vietnam offer examples of countries which were successful in maintaining their freedom when attacked by Asian Communist subversive insurgents. True, the circumstances were not the same as in Vietnam today. Yet in each case the insurgencies were conducted as "wars of national liberation" by native Communists using a revolutionary political base, and these insurgencies were defeated.

The unconventional methods which were developed and used in the successful campaigns in Malaya and the Philippines are the lessons most often studied and adapted for use elsewhere, including in Vietnam. They have their importance. However, both of these successful campaigns had one great lesson in common, which the leaders recognized as the single most significant and vital factor in victory. The great lesson was that there must be a heartfelt cause to which the legitimate government is pledged, a cause which makes a stronger appeal to the people than the Communist cause, a cause which is used in a dedicated way by the legitimate government to polarize and guide all other actions—psychological, military, social and economic—with participation by the people themselves, in order to bring victory. In Malaya, the cause was to safeguard the impending national independence from seizure by Communist neocolonialism. In the Philippines, the cause was to safeguard the Constitution whose true value came to be appreciated as it was made a working document for the people, so that appeals by the Communists to the people to join them in overthrowing the constitutional government by force actually made the Communists a minority against the people's best interests.

These necessarily brief descriptions of two causes cannot convey the strength of their tremendously moving appeal to the people on the two battlegrounds. As with most fundamental truths, their concepts were plain to understand once they were explained correctly. After they were discovered and made effective, they seemed so natural and obvious that many people who had not shared the deep emotions of the insurgent battlegrounds tended to overlook them or underrate their vital significance, looking elsewhere for more romantic or technical foundations from which the victories might be supposed to have been started.

Of specific interest to those concerned with the problems of Vietnam, and as a commentary on the frailty of human perceptions, it should be noted that the vital causes which became the rallying points in Malaya and the Philippines were disregarded during years of tragic struggle in those countries. Once they were recognized and given dynamic use by leaders such as Templar, Magsaysay and others, even though this was done after there had been years of indecisive fighting, the climax of each campaign came quickly. If it can be expressed by a formula, the lesson might be stated as: When the right cause is identified and used correctly, the anti-Communist fight becomes a propeople fight, with the overwhelming majority of the people then starting to help what they recognize to be their own side, and the struggle is brought to a climax. When the propeople

fight is continued sincerely by its leaders, the Communist insurgency is destroyed.

This concept of revolutionary warfare seems to lie close to the heart of American beliefs. In the President's June 23, 1964, press conference, in which he restated our southeast Asian policy, he said, "This is not just a jungle war, but a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity." The month before, the Secretary of Defense explained to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that "the mission of our men in South Vietnam is the same as of those Europeans (he named Kosciusko, Von Steuben, and Pulaski) who came to assist us in our fight for liberty."

Now as already mentioned, the concept that the United States should give advice and counsel on waging revolutionary warfare in the form of a pro-people fight involves exporting American political principles, and some see such an export as something improper, or even immoral. Such an inhibition deserves close scrutiny when it is applied to a life-or-death struggle, such as the one in Vietnam, since it rules out or at least weakens American help in providing the attacked country with a dynamic political answer with which to meet and overcome the foreign ideas introduced by the Communists as the political base of their attack. Lacking such a dynamic answer, the country is left to make do with its own political resources—which, as we have witnessed time after time, often evolve into a one-man leadership with strict control over all national resources, in order to save the country. Americans see this result as a dictatorship and feel a moral inhibition against giving it assistance; some well-meaning people go so far as to attack it. Not surprisingly, the United States thus comes to be looked upon abroad as immature or callous or self-righteous.

Admittedly, great wisdom and sensitivity are required if the United States is to help in the internal political problems of foreign peoples. It would be a drastic change for most U.S. officials to try to satisfy the hesitantly expressed desires of leaders and peoples of sovereign states for political advice with a higher content of American idealism in it. Some might do the task badly, lacking the required perceptivity and understanding of the political backgrounds of either the host country or our own.

Yet the United States has undertaken political tasks of this sort in foreign nations in the past, and the results have brought it considerable honor and prestige. The two most recent examples were Japan and West Germany, defeated nations with which it somehow became "correct" to share the best possible American political thinking. Another example was the Philippines. We tutored the Philippine people and encouraged them in self-government in the same brotherly spirit which elsewhere today could make all the difference in struggles between freedom and Communism. While the Philippines, Japan and Germany are primarily examples of U.S. Government efforts, others which have been most useful were private or semipublic, such as the work of American lawyers abroad in helping establish the legal foundation of government. It is not surprising or unseemly that the Constitution of India contains so many provisions based upon decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, that the 1955 Constitution of Ethiopia recognizes so many of the same rights as does the U.S. Constitution, that the 1940 Constitution of Cuba remains the very antithesis of Castro and the eventual return to its observance one of the great hopes of the Cuban people.

The great cause in Vietnam which last united the overwhelming majority of Vietnamese, both North and South, was "independence." For many of the Vietnamese, including nearly all the Vietnamese leaders with whom we work today in South Vietnam, "independence" was a goal to be won by revolutionary means against a colonial power. In this aspect, Vietnam's revolutionary spirit was close to that of the American Revolution.

The tragedy of Vietnam's revolutionary war for independence was that her "Benedict Arnold" was successful. Ho Chi Minh, helped by Vo Nguyen Giap, Truong Chinh, Pham Van Dong, and a small cadre of disciplined party members trained by the Chinese and Russians, secretly changed the goals of the struggle. Instead of a war for independence against the French colonial power, it became a war to defeat the French and put Vietnam within the neocolonial Communist empire. When they discovered the truth, those patriots who could escaped. It is worth remembering that, after the Geneva Accords were signed in 1954, Vietminh troops were stoned by the population in Qui Nhon, the farmers of Ho Chi Minh's home province of Nghe An revolted against their Communist overlords, and a million Vietnamese fled from Communist territory.

The national revolution was reborn in South Vietnam when Ngo Dien Diem placed the fate of the new nation in the people's hands in 1955. Their secret ballot elected him almost unanimously to become their President, with the mandate to hold further elections for a constitutional assembly which would establish a government to govern with the consent of the governed. This was a revolutionary act, and the Vietnamese people rallied to the cause. Again, it is worth remembering that soon after this election, which had so roused the people to the cause of freedom, the Soviet Union sent representatives to London to meet with the representatives of the other cosponsor of the Geneva Accords, Great Britain. The two sponsoring parties agreed to call off the plebiscite which the accords had scheduled to be held in 1956. An internationally supervised secret ballot in Vietnam might well have gone heavily against the Communists at that time.

Unlike the American Revolution, the reborn national revolution in Vietnam lost its momentum. The spirit of revolution began to be replaced by the spirit of "business as usual," and Diem became more and more shut off from the people. The Communists kept up unceasing psychological pressure to weaken the bonds between government and people, both through character assassination of government leaders and by means of terror. (Informed observers estimate that more than 6,000 minor Vietnamese officials, such as village elders, rural police, and their families, have been murdered by the Vietcong since 1959.) The forcible overthrow of Diem last November and the later coup in January were revolutionary acts in themselves, but appear to have been outside a national revolution at the rice-roots level, since they put the government largely into the hands of the army and the bureaucracy. While these are sizable, organized groups, they still are not the majority of the Vietnamese, the people among whom the Vietcong hide and get support for their operations.

Widely shared feelings about revolution were summed up ably in a document written by the patriot, Dan Van Sung, addressed to other Vietnamese nationalist leaders in July 1963. He wrote:

"Emergent nations like Vietnam are in the midst of a political revolution. They are groping toward a new political and social order. In the process, many ideological schools may be fighting one another. On the one side are the Communists; on the other side are grouped the Nationalists of various tendencies, each of which is still in need of development. Whether the United States likes it or not, the aid program has to take the local revolution into account because American aid is bound to affect the revolutionary course and direction in one way or another, for the benefit or the damnation of the recipient people. This gives rise to a new responsibility which, while not propounded in the implementation of the Marshall plan, must be dealt with realistically. Within the framework of American foreign policy, anticommunism now has a revolutionary context. The American respect for the recipient people's self-determination can no longer be guaranteed by a negative policy of nonintervention which, practically speaking, may lead to just the contrary. In order to make sure that an emergent people really control their own destiny, the United States is expected to make positive efforts helping them develop control of themselves. In other words, American aid ought to be devised so as to help their legitimate aspirations come true through the achievement of their political revolution. This cannot be done without getting to the bottom of the revolutionary situation and taking sides in it, not only for anticommunism but also for democracy. * * * By emphasizing anticommunism rather than positive revolutionary goals and from lack of a better adaptation to the local situation, the United States has reduced its anti-Communist efforts in Vietnam to the maintenance of an administrative machine and of an army. * * * The way out, to our mind, is not by an abandonment but, on the contrary, by going deep into every local revolutionary problem and helping solve them using principles of justice and freedom, and perhaps in fusing them with the revolutionary spirit of 1776."

The foregoing leads to the final question of the feasibility of American help in banding the leaders, the military, the civil servants, and the people of Vietnam into a united force for freedom. This was tried by edict in the emergency national mobilization of August 1964. Yet, the sovereign Vietnamese people, even in such a time of stress, are unlike the defeated Japanese and Germans who had no choice but to submit to a rule by edict, supported by massive American advisory help throughout all echelons of government. In a revolutionary or people's war, such as the war in Vietnam, where the enemy is embedded within the population, the lasting quality needed for a win is the voluntary action of the population in joining together with the government forces, and with the American influence coming from respect and trust earned by the spirit in which individual Americans give their help.

There is no shortcut, no magic formula, to be used in engineering a great patriotic cause led by some universally loved Vietnamese of American selection. This type of puerile romance should not be attempted in real life. Nor does it seem probable in the light of Vietnam's recent history, despite the cheering urban crowds in all too brief moments of great emotion, that the Vietnamese themselves will find quickly and easily any revolutionary solution which will carry them all the way to victory.

At this point in time and experience, perhaps the most valuable and realistic gift that Americans can give Vietnam is to concentrate above everything else on helping the Vietnamese leadership create the conditions which will encourage the discovery and most rapid possible development of a patriotic cause so genuine that the Vietnamese willingly will pledge to it their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor. Among the attributes of such a cause are that it shall give hope for a better future for each Vietnamese, that it shall provide a way for all Vietnamese to work for it, and that it shall have such integrity that it will induce Vietnamese leaders to start trusting one another. A number of actions can be undertaken, step by step, to create the conditions required. Some of them will now be suggested.

Foremost among the specific actions open to the United States is one to help the Vietnamese stabilize their government, even in its caretaker status, so that its leaders can

afford to pay less attention to protecting their backs and more to the future. It is reported that there are several Vietnamese proposals about how to do this among the present leadership. It shoud not be too difficult for the United States to influence the adoption, as a matter of urgency, of the proposal most acceptable to Vietnamese leaders. Its success should be insured through American advisers counseling individual Vietnamese on how to make the project work most harmoniously for the good of all, while being alert to curtail intemperate moves toward a coup or studied disobedience.

Another important need is to help the Vietnamese make the present caretaker government just that, a temporary caretaker, in accord with the government's own expressed desire. It would seem premature to set a precise day to hold elections, such as those announced for late in 1964. The Vietcong subversive insurgents dominate too many villages for truly free universal elections. It would seem more realistic to say that an election will be held on the date when a simple majority of the population can vote by secret ballot, free of any threat.

If democracy is ever to become established in Vietnam, as Vietnamese patriots hope, then political leaders and political parties need encouragement to gain experience and strength. They cannot do this on the political sidelines. Some new place should be found in the government for political leaders not now included, perhaps in a new Assembly of Notables which would fill the void left by the abolition of the consultative Council of Notables. A truly practical task for such an Assembly might be for it to send out committees to check on the situation in hamlets and villages, to certify when conditions become favorable for holding a free popular election for hamlet and village officials, and then to help organize such an election. As a next step, similar procedures could open the way to elections for district chief, then province chief, and, when a majority of provinces are freed, to national elections. This program would provide a practical short-range political goal, give hope that a longer range goal is attainable, stimulate a healthy growth of political parties and start giving people their own government at the rice roots in direct confrontation to the Communist idea.

Americans could add to the attractiveness of these political goals by designing our local aid program to increase social and economic progress at a more rapid pace in villages where elections have been held. The incentive of a system of reward of visible material benefits along with the political benefits of freedom should be a dynamic instrument for accelerating progress. If rewards are given when conditions are stable enough to merit them, rather than in an attempt to buy the loyalties of the people, word of this will spread rapidly throughout the country; and they will not only become a brake on Communist recruiting efforts but also put the American presence in a most favorable context.

A Vietnamese provincial official told an American friend in August that the country would be saved if each of Vietnam's leaders "acted as though each day were his last day to live." Some form of spirited and selfless motivation for all Vietnamese in positions of authority does seem to be required. Perhaps it could be achieved through a Declaration of Liberty or other pledge to serve the country, signed in blood and providing strong penalties for failure to honor it. In any case, American advisers in all echelons, who are in daily association with Vietnamese in positions of responsibility, can encourage loyal patriotism by paying them proper respect. When American advisers express contempt for the fighting quality of the Vietnamese, as reported in our press this summer, it is a sign of the failure of such advisers to help develop the inherent quality of the Vietnamese. They might note and remember that the well-motivated "Sea Swallow" troops of Binh Hung, under Father Hoa, have fought against great odds, and that in almost constant engagements from the end of 1960 to the summer of 1964, 189 of them have been killed in actions in which 2,272 Vietcong were killed.

The most urgent military need is to make it the number one priority for the military to protect and help the people. When the military opens fire at long range, whether by infantry weapons, artillery or air strike, on a reported Vietcong concentration in a hamlet or village full of civilians, the Vietnamese officers who give these orders and the American advisers who let them "get away with it" are helping defeat the cause of freedom. The civilian hatred of the military resulting from such actions is a powerful motive for joining the Vietcong.

If American leaders in Vietnam are to make this war "a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity," and if the Americans with them are to become today's Kosciuskos, Von Steubens and Pulaskis in spirit, they should keep fresh in mind what happened in the hamlets of Tay Ninh province earlier this year, as an affront to every American doctrine, civilian or military. In Tay Ninh province, which is on the Cambodia border and not far from Saigon, two Vietcong battalions had entered a cluster of six adjoining hamlets. They fought their way in, overwhelming and destroying the civil guard post, whose men stood to the last in defense of the hamlets. Once inside, the Vietcong announced that they were going to stay for 72 hours. Then at noon the next day, ARVN, the Vietnamese Army with its American advisers, arrived. ARVN deployed along a half perimeter and for 18 hours poured into these six hamlets all the firepower it could, from the ground and from the air. Meanwhile, of course, most of the Vietcong had slipped out of the unguarded part of the perimeter, not waiting to become targets. Many of the men, women and children of the hamlets had to stay there and take it. Afterwards, survivors said they were grateful to the Vietcong, who had made them dig foxholes.

American bounty, whether in the form of military-civic action or economic aid by U.S. civilians, cannot make up for such mistakes. Nor can it buy the friendship of the Vietnamese people. However, the U.S. military can give a major boost to the political effort simply by upgrading the importance they assign to military-civic action and to guiding the Vietnamese military into accepting it as a basic soldierly quality in this war, just as the Vietcong do. Civic action means more than giving economic help; it is an attitude of behavior, an extension of military courtesy, in which the soldier citizen becomes the brotherly protector of the civilian citizen. The Vietcong practice it, under severe penalties for misbehavior, as point nine of their military oath of honor, which General Giap adopted from the 8th Route Army code of Mao Tse-tung known as the "Three Rules and the Eight Remarks." This code implemented the concept of the people as the water where the troops live as the fish. It must be puzzling to Communist observers to note that Americans in Vietnam usually initiate "civic action" in the form of public works by special ARVN units and not as a performance expected of every soldier. Observers who are most experienced in insurgent warfare believe that the Vietcong will not be defeated until ARVN catches the spirit of civic action and practices it through all ranks.

Vietnam is predominantly an agricultural nation, and what happens in the countryside may well determine the outcome of the war. The Communists are short of food, and the countryside is the prize which they seek above all. When American fertilizers incerase by 100 percent the rice production in one season in one region, the prize becomes all the more tempting to the Communists (however galling must be the comparison with North Vietnam, where Chinese agricultural advisers have had so many failures). But this must not impede the process of economic development. The Americans have also introduced a rudimentary cooperative method in pig raising in the northerly provinces of South Vietnam; if it is recognized and developed to its fullest politico-economic potential, it could be the start of one of the biggest changes in Vietnamese life yet seen. The pig-raising project has brought about the formation of farmers' associations, to handle the paddy-farm end of agrarian credit from the government as well as the distribution of piglets and feed. These farmers' associations are a new form of social unit in Vietnam. If they are encouraged to grow, and become an economic success, and begin having a voice in national affairs, strong bonds will have been created between people and leaders. This operation deserves the attention of the best American political thinking, along with American economic help.

The foregoing are just a sample of actions which Americans can undertake to create favorable conditions for the emergence of a powerful Vietnamese "cause." If devotion to a true revolutionary cause can bring the struggle in South Vietnam to a favorable climax, its revolutionary appeal might eventually spread to the people of North Vietnam, wounding communism at its most vital point—communism's control of the masses.

Whatever course the war in Vietnam takes, Americans will do well to remember the importance of "Nguoi Thuong Dan," the symbolic Vietnamese. It is the name the Vietnamese give to "the man in the street," the rice-paddy farmer, the shopkeeper, the artisan—the citizen. He is the key piece in the whole war in Vietnam, both its subject and its object, the pawn, and in an ultimate sense the decider. There is still time for Americans to help him determine rightly the fate of his country.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1966]

SAIGON'S "PACIFICATION" PLANNERS AWAITING THE PEASANT'S VERDICT—REPEATED FAILURES CAST A LONG SHADOW AS NEW RURAL PROGRAM IS BEGUN UNDER MORE AMBITIOUS CHIEFS

(By Charles Mohr)

SAIGON, JAN. 23.—Although the South Vietnamese Government has given its highest priority this year to a new plan for "rural pacification," some old Vietnam hands express doubt that this is the year when pacification will achieve much.

One official said: "1966 is not the year for pacification. This is going to be the year when the peasant is going to want to sit on the fence more than ever and not choose sides. He will want to see who is winning this war."

But a number of equally hard-bitten veterans of past disappointments in politics and pacification suggest that there is reason for realistic optimism this year.

History seems to be on the side of the cynics. Pacification—the campaign to drive the Vietcong out of the countryside and implant programs that will win the peasants' support for Saigon—has never worked in the past.

"POISONOUS FISH"

As Premier Nguyen Cao Ky said in a major speech recently, all previous governments have had plans "to win the hearts of the

people and to remove the poisonous fish from the pure rural waters."

"What about the results?" he went on to ask. And caustically he answered his own question: "There is no need to repeat the results."

On the other hand, those who are more optimistic also marshal some strong arguments. The Ky government appears to mean what it says when it gives "rural reconstruction" its highest priority. And most American officials suggest that the South Vietnamese and U.S. leadership of the program has vastly improved.

GENERAL PUT IN CHARGE

Last fall, Brig. Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang was appointed Minister of Rural Construction. He got his budget prepared on time for the start of the fiscal year, on January 1, and, in the words of one American official, "has shown an administrative drive and determination to get things done that haven't been seen before in pacification work."

Col. Nguyen Van Chau, chief of Kienhoa Province and an admired innovator of psychological warfare and pacification techniques, was placed in charge of the corps of rural reconstruction teams to be sent into the field.

Edward G. Lansdale, a former Air Force major general who holds the intentionally vague title "senior liaison officer" of the U.S. Embassy, has been the chief adviser to the Government and to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge on pacification.

Mr. Lansdale has had a long career advising Asian governments on combating Communist subversion. He has critics, but his admirers tend to admire him fervently.

The concepts of pacification to be followed this year are not new to the art of counterinsurgency, but many officials describe the overall plan as more coherent, creative, and exciting.

One goal is to put 42,000 rural construction workers, organized into 80-man teams, into the field. These teams are to carry out agitation and propaganda work, set up economic development plans and try to form functioning locally elected hamlet governments.

They will also carry out "census grievance" work, interrogating each peasant in the hamlet once every 10 days. The project will work something like a dental clinic: the peasant will be given his next interrogation appointment as he ends his first session. The work is aimed at identifying the real grievances of the population, correcting them and eliciting intelligence information on the Vietcong secret organization in the countryside.

Meanwhile an effort will be made to see that each person becomes a member of at least one Government-sponsored organization to link the peasants to some disciplined group.

Rural construction teams will train local residents to continue the work after the hamlet has been "pacified."

SOME PROBLEMS EASE

Perhaps it is too early to say that the situation in Vietnam has fundamentally changed in the 7 months of the Ky Government, but some changes appear to have taken place. Some of the problems that doomed past pacification programs may no longer exist, officials say.

One reason for past failures is that from the middle of 1963 to the middle of 1965 the military situation in South Vietnam steadily deteroriated.

Increasingly strong bands of Vietcongs guerrillas made the countryside so dangerous that pacification workers could not operate or in some cases survive.

The military situation is still serious. There are, in fact, more Vietcong troops than ever before. But almost 200,000 American ground troops are in the country, and the weary South Vietnamese armed forces have begun to rebuild battle-torn units and to grow in size.

Officials voice hope for a new military situation in which regular allied troops will harass and pursue full-time guerrilla units in their stronghold areas, creating a shield behind which pacification groups and militamen can try to root out local part-time guerrillas and the Vietcong political organization.

If such a military situation does not develop, officials say, the 1966 pacification plan will be unlikely to achieve significant results.

Another reason that past pacification plans did not work, officials add, is that the efforts were given lip service by everyone from U.S. Cabinet members to junior military officers but were never given real priority.

"We talked about it and drew graphs," an American official has remarked, "but we concentrated on conventional military actions."

Vietnamese province chiefs, for example, tended to expropriate any really effective pacification workers and use them as emergency military reinforcements, informed sources say.

[From the New York Times]

VIETNAMESE WAGE BATTLE ON INFLATION

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SAIGON.—There are two wars in South Vietnam.

United States and South Vietnamese soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen are fighting the more dramatic one—sweating under the tropical sun and risking their lives against an unconventional enemy in a rugged country.

Their struggle may be no more important than that of the American economists who, with their South Vietnamese counterparts, spent last year and will spend this year struggling to hold back economic chaos that could wreck this country as quickly as the Vietcong could.

The chief economic enemy is inflation, and the fight against it was a dominant theme in South Vietnam's life last year.

WOES FOLLOWED SHAKEUP

Until the fall of President Ngo Dinh Diem in November 1963, South Vietnam's economy was rudimentary, and its expenditures were relatively small. Then Government spending jumped, putting more money into circulation, and the armed forces swelled, curtailing the work force.

Other developments were equally unhealthy: the enormous influx of American personnel (200,000 servicemen are here now, and no end is in sight); the "taxes" levied by the Vietcong on goods that merchants brought to market; the tendency of many frightened merchants to hoard, and the relatively unskilled management of national economic policy. In such a situation, inflation was inevitable. Money was plentiful; goods and services were scarce.

RICE PRICE SOARS

For the Saigon housewife shopping in the public marketplace, 22 pounds of rice went from 80 piasters in January to 110 in August, to 125 in October. (A hundred piasters may be worth 55 cents to $1.67, depending on the exchange circumstances.)

Two pounds of shrimp went from 60 to 80 to 120 piasters, a loaf of bread from 6 to 7 to 8, a pedicab ride from 10 to 12 to 15.

Government spending, which totaled 25 billion piasters in 1964, approached 50 billion piasters last year.

In some areas, such as construction, wages have kept pace with costs. But for those on fixed incomes, such as civil servants, white-collar workers and taxi drivers, inflation has meant hardship.

"The only way to put up with the prices," a Saigon woman said the other day, "is to manage somehow to live off the Americans—sell them something, rent them something or work in their offices. They pay well."

U.S. diplomats fearful that a sharp rise in prices would bring blame on the Americans and might undercut the government of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, have taken extraordinary steps to combat the pressure.

By importing rice to replace the portion of the Vietnamese harvest that is seized each year by the Communists, and by airlifting rice from areas where there are surplus stocks, economic planners have prevented great leaps in the rice price. In fact the price of 22 pounds of quality rice on the Saigon market dropped from 150 to 125 piasters in the final 8 weeks of last year.

This victory was important because the demand for rice is—in the language of economics—extremely inelastic: each peasant must have his portion every day, and he will pay steep prices for it if necessary.

To put the matter another way, rice prices are extremely susceptible to inflation.

Another major step was the Americans' adoption of a system of military payment currency, or scrip. Since its introduction in September, the system has limited the circulation of dollars in Vietnam. Servicemen must exchange their scrip for piasters before shopping or eating in Saigon.

In the last 3 months of 1965, about $6 million worth of scrip a month was exchanged for piasters. Before the institution of scrip, roughly this amount in dollars was finding its way onto a flourishing black market here.

DOLLAR FLOW CONTROLLED

The advantages of the innovation are dual: The dollars are kept off the black market to defeat corruption, and they provide foreign exchange to the South Vietnamese Government instead of ending up in Communist China or elsewhere.

The most important American anti-inflation effort remains the commodity-import program, under which Washington buys such goods as dentist chairs or paper-back books for dollars in the United States and sells them to private citizens here for piasters. This system creates a flow of goods to soak up excess spending power.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 24, 1966]

PEASANTS TOIL FOR THE EARTH, NOT FOR A GOVERNMENT

(By Richard Critchfield)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"This earth which formed their home and fed their bodies and made their gods."

The Asian peasant's deep attachment to the soil he tills and in which his ancestors are buried, described in Pearl Buck's "The Good Earth," is strongly evident here in the Mekong Delta rice bowl of South Vietnam.

It is harvest time now. The golden fields of the great fertile plain between the Mekong, Bassac and Saigon Rivers are dotted with men and women winnowing the precious rice against tall, curved shelters of plaited bamboo so as not to lose a grain.

In black pajamas and pointed straw hats, barefoot, bronzed by the January sun, the peasants have the sturdy look of men and women who can endure disease, natural disaster and war so long as they have some land to farm.

But very few have land of their own. In Long An, one of Vietnam's most fertile Provinces, more than 85 percent of the peasant population are tenants.

This landownership pattern may help explain why, despite a tremendous cost in lives and material, the war in Long An is no closer to being won than it was several years ago.

Last year, the heaviest fighting raged in the jungles and rubber plantations north of Saigon, the rain forests and grasslands of

the high plateau and in the swamps and rice paddies of the narrow central coastal plain.

But if the main theater of war lay elsewhere, the rice-rich heartland of the Saigon region and the upper Mekong Delta, linked together by Long An, remains the prize for which the war is being fought.

Here, in less than 14 Provinces, live almost two-thirds of the 15 million South Vietnamese.

In June 1964, the summer before the Vietcong began massing multibattalion forces for pitched battles, Long An was held up as the showplace of how a combined Vietnamese-American military and economic pacification effort could defeat a Communist insurrection.

Visitors went to Long An if they wanted to see how the protracted, guerrilla war was going in the countryside.

But now, 18 months later, little has changed.

There has been no dramatic turn in the guerrilla fighting; the government has won some villages and lost some.

There are no signs of any serious deterioration. But there has been no real improvement either; since it is primarily a war of subversion in Long An, the creeping Communist initiative simply has crept further.

Other peasants have replaced the hundreds of Vietcong killed in battle, and American military and civilian advisers agree there are many more Vietcong than a year ago.

OPPOSING SIDES

Most important in Long An, however, the government and the mass of peasantry still seem to be on the opposing sides of the fight.

None of the successive Saigon governments, has succeeded in analyzing the peasants' grievances and then tried to right these wrongs, though there are signs Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's regime is moving in this direction.

Land is of such paramount importance here that the Vietcong allow only the landless or very poor farmers in the delta to command guerrilla units or qualify as party members.

The provincial government's social order is the exact reverse. Most of the military officers, civil servants, and community leaders come from the landowning gentry.

The same is true in Saigon where only one of the 10 generals now sharing power has any rapport with the masses. He is central Vietnam's erratic Maj. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, who also is the only one of peasant origin.

The traditional Mandarin ruling class fell from power with Ngo Dinh Diem, but their political heirs are the nonpeasant urban middle classes and their relatives.

LODGE PUSHES REFORM

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and his top aids have made it clear that the United States regards major land redistribution as essential in successfully prosecuting the war.

Ky recently announced a land reform program that will initially convey 700,000 acres to 180,000 peasants.

Eventually, the program will be expanded to encompass over 500,000 acres of land formerly owned by the French, 660,000 acres now farmed by "squatters" and 300,000 acres were free titles will be awarded in resettlement areas.

The crux of the problem, however, has yet to be tackled. This is the redistribution from big to small owners of more than 2 million acres in the Mekong Delta.

Good delta land is worth about $50 an acre; it is roughly estimated by the South Vietnamese generals that it would cost between $150 and $200 million to carry out equitable reform programs here.

Land reform under Diem left a bitter aftermath, since 2,279 dispossessed landlords were paid only 10 percent in cash as compensation and given low-interest, nontransferable, 12-year bonds for the rest. The bonds since have plummeted in value.

UNITED STATES GENERATING MONEY

The United States could solve this problem by generating $150 million in local currencies so that an outright compensation could be made.

It already is generating piasters to pay for the Vietnamese share in the war—to the tune of $350 million this year—by giving the Saigon government imported commodities to sell to local merchants.

Both North Vietnam's Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap and the U.S. commander Gen. William C. Westmoreland describe the Vietnam conflict as "a people's war," and not "a war of attrition."

Since the emphasis, first, is on converting and, second, on killing, the investment of $150 million in land reform to undermine the Vietcong's peasant support would seem like a bargain in a war that is costing $16.5 million a week.

During the early days of the Diem regime, the United States spent $4 million on land reform. From 1961 through 1965 nothing was spent. And $1.1 million is budgeted for the current fiscal year.

PROBLEM NOT UNIFORM

The problem is not uniform throughout the country. With the exception of the Saigon area, the upper Mekong Delta and a thin, populated strip along the coastline, South Vietnam is mostly empty terrain. More than 85 percent of the land total is covered with jungle, swampland or dense foliage.

Along the overpopulated coastal fringe, now heavily burdened with refugees, most farms are small and owner-operated and there is real land hunger.

In the highlands, the problem could be solved simply by giving the Montegnard tribes clear title to land they have farmed for centuries.

The real problem is in the delta.

Out of 1.2 million farms, only 260,000 are owner-operated; 520,000 are rented and 330,000 more are partly rented.

There are 71 farms of more than 250 acres and 85,000 more over 12 acres (though all one peasant family can reasonably handle is 5 to 7 acres).

Some 3,000 rich Saigon families still are the big landlords.

In Long An, the pattern is even more lopsided. According to one official U.S. survey made last July, 65 rich landlords, 2,000 farmer-owners, and 28,000 tenant families comprise the population.

COULD INFLUENCE ELECTION

The land-ownership pattern probably would significantly influence the outcome of a free election, such as envisaged in the 1954 Geneva agreements.

Lodge has observed the Communist promises of land to the tiller is "perhaps the greatest appeal the Vietcong have."

Why there is so much opposition to sweeping land reform among some Saigonese is suggested by the tremendous wealth of a delta province like Long An.

In a good year, such as 1963–64, Long An produced 320,000 tons of rice (Saigon's annual requirement is only 600,000 tons.) It also sold that year 10,000 tons of pineapple, 70,000 tons of sugar cane, plus chickens, ducks, pigs, and other cash earners.

The legal land ceiling is 220 acres. Even so, a Saigon landlord who charges double the legal rental rate of 25 percent, as he can do if the land is fertile enough, stands to profit as much as $40,000 in a single year on 220 acres.

This compares with a Vietnamese policeman's monthly wage of $25, or the monthly cash allotment of a Vietcong guerrilla, which is 40 cents.

POLITICAL ATTITUDES AFFECTED

More important perhaps, is how this unequal distribution of land affects the political attitudes of the Vietnamese.

What seems to be absent here is the kind of political code that Theodore H. White has described as President Johnson's "grass roots liberalism":

"You get yours and he gets his and we all share what there is to share."

In Long An, this gets no further than "you get yours" and he, the peasant, can either lump it or try to get his by joining the Vietcong.

But most of the peasants have learned by now that under the Vietcong nobody keeps his.

This has created the kind of political vacuum where many Vietnamese peasants regard the war as a pointles slaughter. They still feel they stand to be the losers no matter who wins.

CAUGHT IN VISE

Caught between bloodsucking landlords, many of whom charge double the legal rents, and pitiless Vietcong tax collectors, who shoot first and talk later, the peasants appear read to call a plague on both sides of this indecisive struggle.

Yet there is an appeal to the Vietcong's three main propaganda themes: "Land to the tiller," "The soldier helps the peasant," and "The government exists for the people."

These are novel and explosive ideas to a man who works knee deep in mud 14 hours a day, growing half his rice for somebody else, whose idea of government may be a venal local tax collector, and whose chickens and ducks may have disappeared when the last militia patrol passed through his village.

If his home has been destroyed or relatives killed by ill-directed bombs and shells, he might make a ready Vietcong convert without knowing what for.

U.S. MILITARY FRUSTRATED

Within the American military command in Saigon, there is widespread frustration over the failure of pacification efforts in the delta provinces like Long An.

One hears talk that the only way the Vietcong fish can be deprived of the water in which they swim is to make things so hot in Communist held zones that the peasants will come over to the Government side as refugees.

Others argue there is no substitute for thoroughgoing land reform.

One veteran American adviser in Long An said:

"These people have country that doesn't need a government. They could go back 2,000 years and they'd be happy, fish in every pond, crabs in every paddy, bananas, coconut, and ducks. All they need is a little land of their own to be happy. Five percent of the Vietnamese in this province are honestly pro-Government by their own personal beliefs and ideology, 5 percent are with the Vietcong for the same reason and the other 90 percent are right."

SENATORS FROM MAINE WHO HAVE SERVED AS CHAIRMEN OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, this coming March 6 the Senate Appropriations Committee will have its 99th birthday, it having been established on that date in 1867 through Senate approval of a resolution submitted by Henry Anthony, a Republican from Rhode Island.

Of all the States, Maine has the most unique record with respect to the chairmanship of this great committee. It is a record of which I am very proud. Maine has had four Senators serve as

chairman, an unusual record, since no other State can boast of having had more than one. In addition to this, a fifth chairman was born and raised in Maine although he served as chairman as a Senator from New Hampshire.

The four Maine Senators serving as chairmen of the Senate Appropriations were Lot M. Merrill, William Pitt Fessenden, Eugene Hale, and Frederick Hale. A fifth chairman, Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, was born in Pembroke, Maine, and attended the University of Maine.

The Maine story on the Senate Appropriations Committee is even more unusual and unique than Maine's championship in the number of chairmen. Senators Eugene and Frederick Hale constituted the only father-son combination in the history of the chairmanship of the committee. Eugene Hale was chairman of the committee from 1909 to 1911 and 2 decades later Frederick Hale served as chairman from December 8, 1932, to March 8, 1933.

Another strikingly unique aspect of the main story in the Senate Appropriations Committee is that of Senators Morrill and Fessenden, as Senator Fessenden succeeded Senator Morrill as chairman of the committee and then later Senator Morrill succeeded Senator Fessenden as chairman. If that sounds confusing, it is understandable because it runs counter to two basic aspects of the chairmanship—first, that the chairmanship ordinarily goes by seniority to the most senior majority member of the committee; second, that such State monopoly of chairmanship is unparalleled.

This is how it happened: Lot M. Morrill, of Maine, became the first chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee with its creation in 1867. He served as chairman for 2 years. He had been elected to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hannibal Hamlin when Hamlin resigned in 1861 and that year became Vice President of the United States.

Senator Morrill served in the Senate until 1869 when he was succeeded by Hannibal Hamlin whom he had previously succeeded. When Senator Morrill left the Senate in 1869, Senator William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, became his successor as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. This was very unusual because Senator Fessenden had not previously served on the Senate Appropriations Committee when he was made chairman. He held the chairmanship from March 4, 1869, to September 9 of that year, the date of his death.

Former Senator Lot Morrill was then appointed to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Fessenden—and contrary to present-day custom, he was again made chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, thus succeeding the man who had succeeded him as chairman of the committee. He held the chairmanship this second time from December 8, 1869, to March 4, 1871, when he left the committee. However, he returned to become chairman a third time on March 12, 1873, and held the chairmanship until July 7, 1876, when he resigned to become Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinets of Presidents Grant and Hayes. He has the distinction of being the only Senator to serve as chairman of the committee on three occasions.

Other Maine Senators who have had the privilege of serving on the Senate Appropriations Committee are Senator James G. Blaine, who once won the Republican nomination for President, Senator Wallace H. White, Jr., who was Senate majority leader during part of his tenure and who was my predecessor, and myself.

Among the historical highlights of these Maine Senators who served as chairmen of the Senate Appropriations Committee are the following facts. The Fessenden family had the unusual distinction of having three brothers in the Congress at the same time, with Senator William Pitt Fessenden's two brothers, Samuel and Thomas, both serving in the House of Representatives in 1863.

Senator Eugene Hale had one of the longest services in the history of Congress with total House and Senate service of 40 years. In his 30 years in the Senate from 1881 to 1911, Senator Eugene Hale had a longer continuous service than anyone then in the Senate, when he retired. He was offered and declined two Cabinet posts, one as Postmaster General in the Cabinet of President Grant, the other as Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Hayes. His son, Frederick Hale, was elected to the Senate 5 years after he retired and served in the Senate for almost 24 years.

Mr. President, I am, indeed, proud of Maine's contribution to the leadership of the Senate Appropriations Committee as provided by these great Maine statesmen who served as chairman of this great committee. As I view their historical accomplishments, I feel extremely fortunate to have served on this great committee for 13 years and since 1953.

ADMINISTRATION PLANS TO DESTROY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY—CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have learned that the Johnson administration is electioneering among private groups to gain support for its plan to destroy the Small Business Administration as an independent agency.

This explains why the President has failed to appoint a new Administrator of SBA.

This explains why the funds of the agency have been so dried up that hundreds, perhaps thousands, of small business loan applications are gathering dust in the regional offices of the SBA.

This explains why Eugene P. Foley, former Administrator of the Small Business Administration, has been transferred to the Department of Commerce.

Perhaps we are seeing a new trend in politics that first became manifest when the Democratic leadership in the Senate opposed the efforts of Republicans to give the Senate Small Business Committee legislative authority. This "small business be damned" attitude, which destroyed the attempt to give the Senate committee the power it should have, has now been unleased again and may bring about the undoing of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency.

Yes, we are witnessing a strange development in American politics—a development that will see the President embrace big business with his right arm while clasping big labor with his left. And woe unto any force that stands in the way of this great triumvirate.

Before reaching their present exalted status, both Lyndon B. Johnson and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY spoke with passion about the need for an independent agency to give small business an effective voice in government, but it seems that times have changed and each has remained silent about the proposal to put small business under the heel of the Department of Commerce.

Why is all this happening, Mr. President? No one really knows, but perhaps some speculation is in order. The special report of the Congressional Quarterly for the week ending January 21, 1966, may provide the clue we are seeking. That report points out that of Democratic individual contributions, in the last presidential campaign, 69 percent were in sums of $500 or more, whereas the bulk of Republican contributions came from the truly small giver.

"Put up or shut up" used to be a gambling expression but it may soon become the password of the Democratic administration.

One wonders what will happen to the small entrepreneurs of America if they must come as supplicants to the Department of Commerce.

Will a department long accustomed to dealing with corporate giants care much or know much about the problems of the small firm? Can such a Department understand how difficult it is for a small businessman to stand up to the competition of his powerful competitors?

Mr. President, I think we all know the answers to these questions.

Lyndon Johnson was right years ago when he supported the establishment of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency. He is wrong now if he plans to let this agency slip down the drain of the Department of Commerce.

Let all the facts come out, Mr. President. Those of us who want small business to survive are ready for a fight.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I congratulate my distinguished friend the Senator from Vermont on his remarks with respect to the Small Business Administration.

Many of us have been interested for a long time in making the Small Business Committee of the Senate a committee which would have legislative authority. As the Senator from Vermont has so well pointed out, this has been supported in the past, when those gentlemen were Members of the Senate, both by the President and the Vice President of the United States.

What the Senator from Vermont has called attention to is something which should demand the attention of everyone

This, of course, would touch only a part of the problem. It is possible, as was suggested by an architect at the American Institute of Architects' 1965 convention on the future of the city, that landowner corporations might be formed to make large-scale redevelopment projects both feasible and profitable, with development funds coming from both private and public sources.

SOLUTIONS THROUGH URBAN TECHNOLOGY

The technical issue is the present orientation of our urban technology. We have rarely used it to solve our massive problems of urban transportation—only to create them.

The size and scale of our cities are growing to a point that conventional cars and roads must, inevitably and soon, be considered obsolete as transportation tools of the 20th century. Thus, in our transportation plans we are turning to refinements of the train; in our transportation studies, we are considering new systems that combine the functions of private car and public train.

COMMUNITY COMMITMENT NEEDED

Finally, and perhaps most crucial of all, we urgently need the absolute commitment of the community leadership to this task if we are to make any significant progress. We have the resources in virtually every community to eliminate ugliness and create an efficient and beautiful environment. Government has the power to utilize programs available at Federal, State, and local levels. It has the power to make regulations and enact ordinances which control the use to which land can be put; it has the authority to launch large-scale design projects and to do many smaller but useful things such as regulating the size and appearance of store and street signs, establishing a municipal tree-planting program, and seeing to it that power lines are placed underground.

The city planning commission is generally the only agency with the authority to create the master plan which the progressive community needs to guide its development. The business leadership, with its demonstrated ability to get things done, is often the only cohesive element within the community which can provide the necessary inspiration, finances, and staying power. Architects and their fellow design professionals are the only ones who can provide the design skills needed to translate social and economic needs into structures, spaces, and beauty.

PUBLIC SUPPORT IS ESSENTIAL

Each of these three forces—local government, the business community, the architectural profession—has a second role to play. It is the common duty of each to help awaken the interest and then to educate and finally to enlist the continuing support of the public.

The American Institute of Architects, for example, has launched a nationwide war on community ugliness to awaken and inform the general public. Architects in 160 Institute chapters are being armed with technical information and promotional tools. We recently produced a major motion picture entitled "No Time For Ugliness." A series of "aesthetic responsibility" conferences has been held with business and government leaders in many communities throughout the Nation. Three filmstrips have been placed in thousands of high schools. We are planning a new program to create an appreciation of the urban environment in primary-grade children. All of these activities have been backedup by a continuing publicity effort in newspapers, magazines, and broadcast media.

Given an enlightened public, a sympathetic Government, and the unrelenting leadership of the business community, what is it that we can aspire to? We can create great compositions of urban design to re-make the urban core, separate pedestrians and vehicular traffic, and attract people to the center of the city as we did many years ago at Rockefeller Center in New York and recently at Constitution Plaza in Hartford.

We can replace the gray areas around our midtown districts with greenbelts which rival the beauty of those in Stockholm. We can create great parks such as those of Rock Creek Park in Washington and the Boston Commons; shape delightful small parks and squares as we have done in San Francisco and Philadelphia; enhance the beauty of our small manmade waterways, as in San Antonio; and transform blighted and rundown streets into gay, stimulating malls, as those of Canton, Ohio, and Fresno, Calif.

We can at last create great outdoor spaces of the stature of the Spanish Steps, the Campidoglio, and St. Peter's Square in Rome; the Piazza San Marco in Venice; and the Place Vendome and Place de la Concorde in Paris. Such a great urban space is part of the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan for our Capital City.

We can create new, self-contained satellite towns with appropriately related houses, townhouses, apartment buildings, business structures, village centers, and open spaces, as is being done at Reston, Va.; Columbia, Md.; and Irvine Ranch, Calif. We can make dynamic plans for the redevelopment of great cities, as is being done in Detroit and Boston. And we can, as we have done in Canton, Fresno, and a few other places, demonstrate how well-designed benches, pools, trash baskets, telephone booths, street lighting fixtures, and textured pavements can enhance urban living in the most modest of circumstances and smallest of spaces. These cosmetic improvements are highly desirable, and can add gaiety and stimulation to the city. But they must not be confused with the need for large-scale design changes in our urban centers.

THE CITIES WE DESERVE

The city is the natural gathering place for our thinkers, our innovators, and our specialists. It is where education flourishes and art is born. It is the generator of our national wealth. There is no earthy reason why it should be dirty, dull, urgly, and generally unlivable. It should be, in fact, our greatest work of art.

It has been said that the values and accomplishments of any age can be measured by the quality of the architecture it leaves behind. Another way of saying this is that people get the kind of urban life they deserve. But if they never have a chance to know what city life can be like, then we cannot justly blame them for spending their lives in drab and ugly surroundings.

If, after experiencing urban beauty and stimulation, the Nation's citizens reject it at the polls and in their citizens' meetings and elect to ride through the neon jungle eating chicken-in-a-basket, we can say they got the ugly cities they desirve. But not until that day. It is our mission to give them the opportunity to make an informed choice. For myself, I have no doubt what it will be.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF MEDICARE ENROLLMENT PERIOD

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have today asked my able and distinguished colleague from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] to add my name as a cosponsor to his bill S. 2882, which would amend title 18 of the Social Security Act to extend to June 30 the period for enrollment in the program of supplementary benefits for the aged as provided under part B of that title. This program is an important part of the medicare legislation which we enacted last year.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, despite the miracle of modern instantaneous communications, many older citizens who are eligible for the part B program do not realize that the deadline for enrollment in it, which is March 31, is virtually upon us. If they fail to sign up, they will have to wait 2 more years before they again become eligible.

In my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, many elderly people are not fully aware of the fact that there is more to medicare than the hospitalization program in which they have been automatically enrolled. Pennsylvania's able and compassionate secretary of public welfare, Arlin M. Adams, has told me that he has appeared on television several times in an effort to spread the word about the supplementary benefits of medicare and about the imminence of the March 31 deadline for signing up.

S. 2882 has been referred to the Committee on Finance. I respectfully urge its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to schedule early consideration of this urgently needed measure. Meanwhile, I urge my fellow Pennsylvanians who are 65 or older to enroll in the part B program before the March 31 deadline.

VN

VIETNAM VICTIMS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a revealing article entitled, "The People Beneath the War," by Raymond R. Coffey, appeared in a recent issue of the Nation magazine. Coffey has just returned from a 4-month reporting assignment in Vietnam for the Chicago Daily News.

This article, which is a straight piece of reporting, is one more illustration of the folly of our military commitment in southeast Asia, a folly the enormity of which will be increasingly apparent as this undeclared war goes on.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "The People Beneath the War," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PEOPLE BENEATH THE WAR

(By Raymond R. Coffey)

Representative ROBERT MCCLORY, Republican, of Illinois, was winding up a 2-day visit to Vietnam when he was encountered one afternoon armed with a movie camera and loping down Saigon's Le Loi Boulevard in a late November downpour. One of the more obscure Members of the Illinois congressional delegation, MCCLORY had dropped in for a firsthand look at the war as it can be seen from the well-traveled VIP path being worn into the Vietnamese terrain these days.

"I find the (Vietnamese) people range from indifferent to hostile," MCCLORY began as he came in out of the rain, joining a reporter in the shelter of an arcade. "But things are going well for us," he concluded. Though he appeared oblivious to the paradox in what he said, MCCLORY had neatly stated one of the saddest facts of the war.

Everyone talks about this being a political war in which the key to victory is, as the weariest cliche in Saigon goes, to "win the hearts and minds of the people." And yet, as the fighting grows in scale and intensity, there appears to be more and more inclination to judge progress in military terms alone. What's happening to the Vietnamese people, what they're getting out of it all, and what they think about the war appears to be of ever-diminishing concern.

substantial statistical evidence of this change, for Connecticut has less than a third of the number of serious accidents that afflict a State such as Nevada.

For a time Ribicoff was chairman of a Governors' committee on automotive safety. Later, as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he initiated many studies of the subject. Still later, as Senator he continued his crusade as chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations. Last year he held extensive hearings which received testimony from many agencies, government and private. He has a bill before the Senate which provides for very considerable Federal study and regulation. This bill may be supplanted soon by a Presidential message and bill which was promised in the annual message.

TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

This investigation, together with the President's interest, makes the subject one of the most important public questions that will be faced this year. Such efforts as have been made will provide a vast amount of public education which, in itself, will have a salutary effect, I hope, upon the millions of automobile drivers and owners, government officials, at all levels, and also manufacturers.

A laborious examination of the testimony in those hearings, as well as material supplied by many public and private agencies interested in the subject, leads me to a number of very tentative conclusions:

1. In almost every accident there are three components: the driver or drivers, the environment outside the vehicle, and the vehicle itself. By the environment I mean the roadway; the regulatory agencies, including the police; and, in some cases, the weather and terrain.

2. Of those three, the driver almost always is the major cause of accidents. The environment is next, and the vehicle is third.

3. Measures to assure more safety must be directed at all three, with most emphasis upon the first two. And here the leadership must come from Government and the automotive industry.

4. Accident reporting is sketchy and varied, according to the jurisdiction in which the accident occurs. Thus, the raw data on which remedial conclusions can be reached are insufficient.

5. This lack of data greatly handicaps the many research activities that have been conducted for years by the automotive industry, the governments and various private agencies. The result is that those concerned have inadequate information upon which methods of improvement can be built.

6. In the automotive industry a great deal has been spent in money and talent, in individual companies and cooperatively, to create better and safer cars, to provide information for the guidance of many public agencies, and for the purpose of education in the schools and research institutions.

7. It must be realized that the tremendous impact of the automobile on our civilization has created problems which have accumulated so fast that all those concerned have had difficulty in mastering them.

8. The pressing needs are not only for more information, study, and research but, on the basis of what we now know, for more uniform, and stricter tests for drivers; for more driving education, especially for the young; for inspection of all cars by public authority; for national standards in road construction and improvements and for more safety devices in new cars. Whether any or all of these should be done by the Federal Government or by cooperation among the States and local governments or, in the case of car design be left to the industry are major issues in 1966.

THE GREAT URBAN CHALLENGE—ARTICLE BY MR. MORRIS KETCHUM, JR.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Morris Ketchum, Jr., the distinguished President of the American Institute of Architects recently wrote a most interesting article urging sound planning and the energetic cooperation of private business, local government and the Federal Government as partners in building livable and beautiful towns and cities. Speaking from long experience as a distinguished architect and designer, his article makes clear that we can and must make our cities places of delight and beauty rather than dreary barracks and neon-lighted slums. At a time when the vast majority of Americans live in urban areas, Mr. Ketchum's call for sound planning and creative thinking for our cities is a message that cannot be repeated too often, and I am sure his thoughtful comments will be of interest to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "The Great Urban Challenge", which was published in the G. E. Forum, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GREAT URBAN CHALLENGE

(By Morris Ketchum, Jr., F.A.I.A., president, American Institute of Architects)

NOTE—Morris Ketchum, Jr., is president of Morris Ketchum, Jr. & Associates, an architectural firm which has designed buildings in 30 American States and several nations. Among the firm's recent projects are the U.S. Embassy in Rabat, Morocco; campus planning and buildings for the State University of New York; and several large schools and housing projects in New York City. Besides his position as president of the AIA, he is past president of the Architectural League of New York and the Municipal Art Society of New York. A recognized authority on department store planning, Mr. Ketchum has been a lecturer or critic at Yale University, Pratt Institute, New York University, and the Cooper Union.

The greatest domestic challenge we face today, this distinguished architect believes, is the future of the city. For practical solutions to urban problems, he says we must:

Redefine the political and economic philosophy concerning use of public and privately held land.

Reorient our urban techonology to solving, rather than creating, metropolitan problems.

Enlist the wholehearted commitment of business, local government, and the design professionals to create livable, beautiful communities.

The next 10 years may be the most critical in the history of our Nation, not excluding the wars which have attended its founding, consolidation ,and defense of the free world. During this next decade, our mounting population, expanding technology, and the rapid decay of our urban centers will force radical changes upon the form, function, and appearance of the American city.

In the next few years, we may prove to the world that, for the first time in man's history, a democratic people can build cities that are efficient, livable, and beautiful—in short, an urban environment of excellence. It is equally possible, however, that in these same few years, we may, through default and apathy, create the most terrifying urban mess that man can imagine. America the Beautiful may, in all its glory and technical excellence, go down the drain.

HAVE WE GROWN TOO FAST?

My own feeling is that we have created the mess around us because we have grown so fast. In the headlong process of learning new things, we have forgotten a great deal.

An architect I know says of this: "It isn't that we're stupid. We just have lousy memories." It is a cogent statement. We have a rich and valid heritage in community design. Thomas Jefferson, our third President and an architect, designed not only Monticello and the campus of the University of Virginia, but several towns. He also made a design for the city of Washington before L'Enfant did, and he proposed a national public works program. William Penn's original design for Philadelphia was strong enough to guide the orderly development and redevelopment of that city to this day.

For whatever reason, these and other early communities were designed and built according to a plan. We design our mechanical contrivances and space vehicles and we plan our business affairs. The businessman who did not plan would be considered a fool. Yet, we continue to rebuild our towns and cities, expand our metropolitan areas, and tear up the suburban countryside without plans. We try to control unwholesome uses of land with nothing more than the weak and negative tool of zoning. We are just beginning to see the result.

The greatest domestic challenge we face today, I believe, is the future of the city. The problems are apparent, and the solutions, at least in outline form, are beginning to appear. In my view, they include: (1) a redefinition of our political and economic philosophy concerning the use of public and privately held land; (2) a reorientation of our urban technology; and (3) the energetic and wholehearted commitment of the business community, local government, the architectural profession—as partners—creating livable and beautiful towns and cities.

The political issue is no longer one of planning versus haphazard growth. Only the most misguided sort of person would argue today that community design is undesirable. We have seen and are still seeing the kinds of urban ugliness and disorder that result from the philosophy that land can be treated as a commodity for random, unlimited exploitation.

COMBINING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RESOURCES

Now we face a fundamental decision. We know that our present system of unlimited and uncontrolled speculation is disastrous; yet we tend to find repugnant the policy of sweeping Government control which planned and built the new towns of Great Britain and Scandinavia.

We combine the use of public and private resources when the Government condemns, assembles, and clears a tract of land under the urban renewal program and then sells it to a private entrepreneur. One of the best recent examples of this process is Constitution Plaza, in Hartford, Conn. Roger Williams, the astute vice president of the Travelers Insurance Co., which invested $40 million in the project, recently pointed out that the site, prior to development, contributed $90,000 per annum to the city in taxes. As of 1965, it will contribute $1,456,000 per annum, and it has created a substantial building boom around it, literally rejuvenating the city.

There is no good reason why government should not participate in the redevelopment of the American city. Similarly, there is no good reason why private enterprise should not participate more fully and expertly than it is doing at present. Government could encourage this a great deal by granting tax rebates for property improvements, to name but one of many possibilities.

The shooting war is coming to be such a full-time job that political and social problems get shuffled to the bottom of the pile. And, almost imperceptibly, people like McCLORY—and others with considerably more experience and responsibility in Saigon—develop the notion that the war can be going well even if the Vietnamese are indifferent, hostile, apathetic, or unhappy. The fact is, the long-suffering people have been given little reason to support the Government side of the war. The U.S. goal, supposedly, is to guarantee them liberty and an opportunity to establish some kind of free and representative government. But if the shooting stopped tomorrow, the populace of Vietnam would still be stuck with a military dictatorship, a system that is astonishingly corrupt and incompetent.

It's probably true, as U.S. officials in Saigon insist, that the military is the only organization in the country capable of running a government in the current situation. It is also perhaps true that the last thing the country needs for a while is another coup. But it does seem that, with all the leverage our economic and military presence gives us, the United States should be able to lean on the Saigon government a lot harder to make it more responsive to and more concerned with the people.

The Vietcong are hardly popular heroes, despite what many of the antiwar demonstrators at home appear to think. They can be harsh and terroristic, they conscript labor and troops by force, they bleed the peasantry for rice and taxes. But they do, as one U.S. counterinsurgency expert in Saigon put it, have an "image of morality" and they do promise the people a better life, even if they haven't delivered. That puts them far ahead of the Saigon regime, with its generals roaring around in big black limousines and their wives getting rich by speculating in real estate near American bases.

Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, the jaunty little air force general who heads the present government, is considered to be personally honest and to have a genuine concern for his country. His own position, however, is precarious and he is trapped with very little personal power in a sick system that almost daily gives the people another reason to doubt in victory and its rewards.

Several weeks ago the U.S. mission pulled its aid representatives out of Binh Tuy Province on the basis of evidence that the province chief, a Lt. Col. Pham Dinh Chi, had diverted to his own uses a substantial amount of U.S. money. The aid men also had reportedly been threatened with death if they exposed the situation. Ky hemmed and hawed for weeks under U.S. pressures to oust Chi. Finally he did—but only to give him another post in the defense ministry where the pickings may be even better.

The government also talks a good game of political freedom. Ky informs student groups, for example, that they are free to discuss and criticize the government. Anyone who takes him at his word is looking for trouble. "We are not going to have seminars [demonstrations] in the streets," Ky says. One of Saigon's English-language newspapers was recently slapped with a 5-day suspension because a censor decided that it was printing news stories comforting to the Vietcong. Anyone who shows promise of leadership or of developing a following is looked upon as a dangerous threat to the incumbents, instead of as an asset to a county that needs leaders as much as it needs peace.

Shortly before leaving Vietnam, I wrote a story about a political-social action project in one of Saigon's worst slum quarters. A small group of dedicated young army officers and government officials had persuaded Ky to let them try a new approach among the poor who are most vulnerable to the Vietcong and have the least reason to believe in the government. They had recruited hundreds of part-time student volunteers who were helping the people to build schools, establish dispensaries, organize hog-raising coops, even to hold unofficial hamlet elections to choose their own spokesmen. The project greatly interested the United States; it was a hopeful new effort to "win the hearts and minds of the people." Ky and U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge themselves had visited the project.

But less than 24 hours after the story about the project had gone through the government-run cable office, a young army lieutenant, who is one of the leaders of the project, was called upon by a representative of the national police and reprimanded for getting "too much personal publicity."

The Vietcong promise the people land reform and a better break in life. Now and then the Ky government talks about reforms, too, but mostly it simply lectures the people sternly about how it is everyone's duty to support the war and the government. No one bothers even to tell the people what they might expect in the way of improvement if and when the war ends.

"They (the government) don't trust the people," the young lieutenant who was reprimanded said. "The crisis in our country is that no one has confidence in anyone any more. We cannot have a (social) revolution just by changing the actors in the scenario. We must start at the bottom with the people." The people, according to the lieutenant, don't believe anything the government says. They want to see action—the kind of action they were getting from the student volunteers in the slum project—before they will start believing words again.

The most discouraging thing about the whole situation is that the government, from Saigon to the remotest district, is indifferent to what the people want or expect. Every province and district chief is appointed by Saigon and is a military man with command responsibilities, as well as civilian administrative duties. U.S. military and civilian representatives out in the country complain that often they have a hard time even getting their Vietnamese counterparts to stand around and look interested in village civic action programs, such as visits by American medical teams. The U.S. representatives take great pains to make it appear that such aid comes from and is arranged by the Vietnamese Government. But their efforts are often futile, because the local Vietnamese government man makes plain that he knows nothing about the program and cares less.

A U.S. adviser, giving one typical example, said that his district chief agreed to take part in a food and clothing distribution program only after he was permitted to take for his wife a few of the surplus WAC blouses that were to be distributed among the needy women of a village.

If, then, the job is winning over the people, it is a job that is going very badly. And, despite McClory and the U.S. military brass whose opinions he was obviously echoing, the military side of the war is not going a great deal better. It's perhaps true, as Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara says, that we've "stopped losing," but we're still a long, long way from winning, even militarily.

Astonishment is sometimes expressed that Hanoi does not seem exactly panting for the chance to negotiate. The reason seems plain enough; the other side is nowhere near convinced that it has lost all chances for victory. American and Vietnamese troops are inflicting tremendous casualties on the enemy. But our own losses are mounting, and, despite the thousands of enemy soldiers killed in the past year, enemy strength has grown. The Vietcong now control a greater part of the countryside than they did a year ago. Thus the Saigon Government is invisible and unknown in many areas of the country. How can people be persuaded to support something they can't even see, a government that offers them no security against the Vietcong?

The U.S. forces in Vietnam, now totaling around 200,000 men, are performing splendidly. They are brave, tough, resourceful, well motivated in battle. Beyond that, they generally exhibit more interest in and compassion for the people they're living amongst than does the Vietnamese Government. The same, unhappily, cannot be said of the Vietnamese military. They continue to suffer many more casualties than do the Americans, and that indicates something about their willingness to fight. However, many of their casualties still result from an apathetic unwillingness to learn the lessons of guerrilla warfare, and from a lack of aggressiveness and leadership among their officers.

The officer corps is very weak, excessively occupied with keeping Saigon happy and inclined to duck a fight. Vietnamese commanders are always more than ready to break off an engagement in time to get back to camp for lunch. They tend to look upon their jeeps as something they have been given to get their kids to and from school. Beyond all this, it is a fact that Americans don't really trust the Vietnamese who fight beside them. American commanders privately complain that securtiy is often compromised as soon as the Vietnamese are informed of a military operation.

Another factor that weighs against the "things are going well" judgement of McCLORY and others is the massive increase in enemy arms and men being infiltrated from the north. The enemy is no longer a ragtag bunch of poorly armed guerrillas wearing black pajamas and wondering where their next bowl of rice is coming from. In the recent major battles in the Ia Drang Valley, for example, the U.S. 1st Air Cavalry Division tangled with North Vietnamese regulars who were well equipped and well armed with Russian and Chinese weapons, including a high proportion of automatic weapons that can be deadly against low-flying aircraft. The enemy troops were carrying, in many cases, a basic load of 120 rounds of ammunition per man. That is more than a whole platoon of Vietcong guerrillas would often have in days not long past.

The one great weapon we have that the enemy still lacks is air power. But air power, the way it is being used in this war, is not always an asset. There have been many calls for an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, but it appeared to some in Vietnam that a more urgent problem was restricting the "in-country" bombing of South Vietnam.

Our pilots have done a magnificent job of providing close air support for troops engaged with the enemy on the ground. And no one argues with the use of air power in those situations. However, there are also hundreds of air strikes every day against villages and other targets "suspected" of harboring the Vietcong in cases where there is no ground engagement. Thus one day just outside Saigon six Vietcong were reported seen among a string of thatch huts lining a canal. Hours later, long after the enemy had left, I rode along with a forward air controller in a light Cessna who directed a flight of eight Skyraider dive bombers in an attack on the target. Four huts were destroyed, four were damaged and huge black craters were torn in the surrounding rice paddies. Should it take eight airplanes and thousands of pounds of bombs to knock out eight flimsy huts? And what evidence was there really that the huts and rice paddies were owned by the Vietcong?

On another day, a paratroop unit approaching a small village drew half a dozen rounds of small-arms sniper fire. The unit halted and called in an air and artillery strike that level the village. It seemed an extraordinary response to a few rounds of sniper fire, and one not likely to "win the

hearts and minds" of any innocent civilians in the village.

Many of the Vietnamese jamming the refugee camps all over the country make clear that they came into the government areas not out of any particular fondness for the government and not to escape the Vietcong, but to get out from under our bombs. Top military authorities in Saigon say great care and discrimination is exercised in selecting targets. But some of the top counterinsurgency experts in the U.S. mission, and some of the advisers working out in the countryside, still believe the "in-country" bombings in some cases are hurting our cause among the uncommitted people.

But, as Congressman McCLORY's distressingly innocent comments made so discouragingly plain, there are people who somehow believe the war can be going well regardless of what the Vietnamese people think or feel or want.

BANK MERGER ACT AMENDMENTS—CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on reviewing the remarks I made yesterday in connection with the passage of the bank merger bill, I find at page 2538 of the RECORD the statement:

I invite attention to the fact that there are four members of the Committee on Banking and Currency who voted to instruct me to move to accept the House amendments.

I am sorry to say that this statement is incomplete.

The Banking and Currency Committee met informally at 10 yesterday morning to consider the House bill and the changes which the House made in the Senate bill.

The committee discussed the various versions of the bill at some length, particularly with reference to the question of intervention by the Federal and State banking agencies in litigation attacking proposed mergers.

Four members of the committee moved to instruct me to accept all the House amendments except the amendment authorizing this intervention. After this motion had been defeated by a vote of 4 yeas to 9 nays, the committee instructed me, by a vote of 9 yeas to 2 nays, to accept the House amendments in toto.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding on this subject in the future, I ask unanimous consent that the comment in question be amended to read as follows in the permanent edition of the RECORD:

I invite attention to the fact that at the meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee this morning to discuss the House amendments to the Senate bill, while the final vote to instruct me to accept the House amendments was 9 yeas to 2 nays, four members of the committee had previously voted to instruct me to accept all of the House amendments except the one authorizing intervention by Federal and State banking authorities in suits attacking bank mergers.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION IN 1965

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in this year of water shortages in so many areas of our Nation, and with our growing awareness of the clear and present danger of food shortages resulting from the population explosion, a report from the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, summarizing its accomplishments during 1965, will be of interest to all of the Members of the Senate.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I ask unanimous consent to have this summary report printed in the RECORD.

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

RECLAMATION BUREAU'S 1965 ACCOMPLISHMENTS SUMMARIZED IN STATISTICAL REPORT

Accomplishments of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation during fiscal year 1965 played a significant role in establishing the new high level attained by the economy of the Western States and the Nation, Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy said yesterday.

The agency chief made this comment in connection with releasing statistics on operations of the Bureau during the 12-month period ending June 30, 1965.

A highlight of achievement during the year was completion of Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River in Arizona. The second highest dam in the United States, Glen Canyon won the Outstanding Engineering Achievement Award—1964, which is presented annually by the American Society of Civil Engineers to "the engineering project that demonstrates the greatest engineering skills and represents the greatest contribution to civil engineering and mankind."

The multipurpose dam is the principal feature of the far-flung Colorado River storage project, and revenues from its powerplant will pay the lion's share of the cost of the entire project, including the participating projects. The reservoir behind Glen Canyon Dam, Lake Powell, with its unique, beautiful scenery and its many-faceted outdoor sports opportunities, has already become one of the leading recreation areas in the Nation.

The other five dams completed in 1965 are: Norman Dam on Little River in Oklahoma; Clark Canyon Dam on Beaverhead River in Montana; Cheney Dam on the North Fork of the Ninnescah in Kansas; Norton Dam on Prairie Dog Creek in the Republican River Basin in Kansas; and the Willard Dam on Bear River in Utah.

These bring to 216 the number of Bureau storage dams and dikes. The reservoirs behind the structures have a total capacity of nearly 127 million acre-feet of water, or more than 40 trillion gallons.

The water stored in these lakes, when they are full, would be sufficient to supply all the water needs of every man, woman, and child in the United States for approximately 3 years.

During 1965 the Bureau of Reclamation also completed power facilities capable of generating 450,000 kilowatts. It operated 48 hydropower plants with a combined capacity of 6,248,800 kilowatts of electricity, and from these and 6 other federally operated plants it marketed more than 33 billion kilowatt-hours, realizing revenues of $100.9 million from the sales and other power income.

Reclamation's benefits to recreational opportunities and fish and wildlife enhancement were also cited by Commissioner Dominy, who said that 34.3 million visitor-days were recorded during the 1964 tourist season at 210 recreation areas on reclamation projects.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, when we created the Community Relations Service in 1964, we did so in the belief that one of the major hurdles in implementing the Civil Rights Act would be in the field of public accommodations, primarily in the South. This has not developed as we had anticipated.

We placed the Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce because we felt it would be an instrument for assistance in public accommodations compliance, and the Commerce Department would be an appropriate place to carry out this mission. Now experience has shown that the Community Relations Service has not had to devote nearly as much of its efforts to conciliating disputes over public accommodations discrimination as we had expected.

The experience of the Service also has shown that there is an area where the Service increasingly has been called upon to provide assistance. And that is the area of our large urban centers where racial problems are on the rise. Just about everyone who has been concerned with the problem foresees now that this trend is likely to continue. Our legal instruments for dealing with racial problems are, of course, lodged in the Department of Justice. And just as we turned here for law enforcement when the problems were centered mainly in the South, Northern problems also land in the Attorney General's office. Unhappily, the problems that beset urban and Northern areas cannot always be approached through law enforcement.

As the Attorney General and his staff more and more ponder what they can and cannot do in these broadening areas, let us provide them with an alternative. Let us place the Community Relations Service where it can best function in the light of our emerging needs. Let us place it closer to the frequent point of entry of most of Federal Government's concern in civil rights matters. Let us equip this Government so that it can carry out its responsibilities in the most flexible, coordinated and swiftest manner.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is indeed a privilege for me to join our distinguished colleague of Kentucky, Senator COOPER, in cosponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 133 designating February of every year as American History Month.

Today our greatest concern is the struggle for freedom in Vietnam. Our heritage demands the presence of American boys in that distant country. My concern is that some Americans are not fully aware of this heritage and why it requires that we honor our commitments in foreign lands. Setting aside 1 month out of the year to recognize American history will emphasize its importance and relevance to current affairs.

In the history of mankind, this country has played a recent but nonetheless vital and significant role. Here man has found freedom and has established a form of government to secure that freedom. Here man has found economic freedom and has devised an economic system to perpetuate that freedom. Here

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

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

ABRAHAM LINCOLN SUGGESTS FULL DISCLOSURE ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Mr. Harry Golden, a trenchant and perceptive writer whose column appears in the Washington Daily News among other Scripps-Howard newspapers, has provided us with memorable quotations from the speeches and writings of Abraham Lincoln, whose birth date we mark Saturday.

Mr. Golden makes this observation:

> Lincoln's simple opening of his House Divided speech in 1859 serves us for today: "If we would first know where we are, and wither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

More than a century after these words, our Nation is again divided on the issue of an undeclared war.

Mr. President, I submit that indeed "we could better judge what to do, and how to do it" if this administraiton would offer full discussion of the issues in southeast Asia.

Only then can "we know where we are, and whither we are tending."

Only when the people, and the elected representatives of the people, are provided with all the facts can we make a judgment on our policy in Vietnam.

As determined as I am, as determined as we all are, to halt the encroachment of communism, the methods we use in this objective must be worthy of public examination and judgment.

I ask that we have full and open discussion of the issues motivating the decisions being made today, affecting as they do the course of history for years to come.

Mr. Golden reminds us that after three bitter and frustrating years of the American Civil War, Mr. Lincoln wrote to a friend:

> I have been controlled by events.

What a lesson is there here for us today.

Are we being controlled by events, rather than controlling those events?

Is our foreign policy as applied to southeast Asia one of reaction to the Communists? Are we then to be led by them step by bleeding step into a land mass war with Red China in a place and at a time of their choosing?

Mr. President, the American people deserve a more complete exposition of the facts decisive to their destiny.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE KENNAN ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the men most qualified to guide our thinking on American foreign policy is Mr. George Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia, and author of the U.S. containment policy of the post-World War II period.

His statement before the Committee on Foreign Relations today is one of the finest presentations I have seen, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF GEORGE F. KENNAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the subject on which I am invited to give my views this morning is, as I understand it, the complex of problems connected with our present involvement in Vietnam. May I explain, in undertaking to speak to this subject, that southeast Asia is a part of the world for which I can claim no special knowledge. I am not familiar with the official rationale of our policy there, except as it has been reflected in the press. I cannot recall that I have ever, either during my service in Government or subsequently, been consulted by the executive branch of our Government on the problems of our policy in southeast Asia or even been made privy to the official discussions in which that policy was decided. I am sure there are many data relevant to any thoroughly founded judgment on these matters which are not available to me. This being the case, I have tried not to jump to final conclusions, even in my own thoughts, and to remain sympathetically receptive both to our Government's explanations of the very real difficulties it has faced and to the doubts and questions of its serious critics. I have not been anxious to press my views upon the public; but I gladly give them to you for whatever they are worth, claiming no particular merit for them except that they reflect an experience with Communist affairs running back, now, for nearly 40 years, and that they flow from the deepest and most troubled concern that we should find the right course at this truly crucial juncture.

The first point I should like to make is that if we were not already involved as we are today in Vietnam, I would know of no reason why we should wish to become so involved, and I can think of several reasons why we should wish not to. Vietnam is not a region of major industrial-military importance. It is difficult to believe that any decisive development of the world situation is going to be determined by what happens on that territory. Were it not for the considerations of prestige that arise out of our existing involvement, even a situation in which South Vietnam was controlled exclusively by the Vietcong, while regrettable and no doubt morally unwarranted, would not present, in my opinion, dangers great enough to justify our direct military intervention. Given the situation that exists today in the relations among the leading Communist powers, there is every likelihood that a Communist regime in South Vietnam would follow a fairly independent political course. There is no reason to expect that such a regime would find it either necessary or desirable, in present circumstances, to function simply as a passive puppet and instrument of Chinese power. And as for the danger its establishment there would unleash similar tendencies in neighboring countries, this would depend largely on the manner in which it came into power. In the light of what has recently happened in Indonesia and on the Indian subcontinent, the danger of the so-called domino effect of a limited Communist success in that area seems to me to be considerably less than it was when the main decisions were taken that led to our present involvement.

From the long-term standpoint, therefore, and on principle, I think our military involvement in Vietnam has to be recognized as unfortunate—as something we would not choose deliberately if the choice were ours to make all over again today; and by the same token I think it should be our Government's aim to liquidate this involvement just as soon as this can be done without inordinate damage to our own prestige or to the stability of conditions in that area.

It is obvious, on the other hand, that this involvement is today a fact. It creates a new situation. It raises new questions, ulterior to the basic long-term problem, which have to be taken into account. A precipitate and disorderly withdrawal could represent in present circumstances a disservice to our own interests and even to world peace greater than any that might have been involved in our failure to engage ourselves there in the first place. This is a reality which, if there is to be any peaceful resolution of this conflict, will have to be recognized not only by the more critical of our friends but by our adversaries as well.

I have, at the same time, great misgivings about any deliberate expansion of hostilities on our part directed to the achievement of something called victory—if, by the use of that term, we envisage the complete disappearance of the recalcitrance with which we are now faced, the formal submission by the adversary to our will, and the complete realization of our present stated political aims. I doubt that these things can be achieved even by the most formidable military successes. There seems to be an impression that, if we bring sufficient military pressure to bear, there will occur at some point something in the nature of a political capitulation by the other side. I think this is a most dangerous assumption. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have, between them, a great deal of space and manpower to give up, if they have to, and the Chinese can give them more if they need it. Fidelity to the Communist tradition would dictate that, if really pressed to extremity on the military level, they should disappear entirely from the open scene and fall back exclusively on an underground political and military existence, rather than accept terms that would be openly humiliating and would represent in their eyes the betrayel of the political prospects of the causes to which they are dedicated. Any total rotting out of the Vietcong from the territory of South Vietnam could be achieved, if it could be achieved at all, only at the cost of a degree of damage to civilian life, and civilian suffering generally, for which I should not like to see this country responsible. And to attempt to crush North Vietnamese strength to a point where Hanoi could no longer give any support for Vietcong political activity in the south would almost certainly have the effect of bringing in Chinese forces at some point, whether formally or in the guise of volunteers, thus involving us in a military conflict with Communist China on one of the most unfavorable theaters of hostility that we could possibly choose.

This is not the only reason why I think we should do everything possible to avoid the escalation of this conflict. There is another one which is no less weighty. This is the effect the conflict is already having on our policies and interests further afield. Not only are great and potentially more important questions of world affairs not receiving, as a consequence of our preoccupation with Vietnam, the attention they should be receiving, but in some instances assets we already enjoy, and hopeful possibilities we should be developing, are being sacrificed to this unpromising involvement in a remote and secondary theater of activity. Our relations with the Soviet Union have suffered grievously as was to be expected—and this at a time when far more important things were involved in those relations than what is inolved in Vietnam, and when we had special reason to cultivate them. More unfortunate still, in my opinion, is the damage being done to the feeling entertained toward us by the Japanese people. The confidence and the

violations may now be prosecuted; the other would put an end to racial discrimination in the selection of juries.

Since then—indeed only on Monday—a three-judge Federal court in Montgomery, Ala., in an unprecedented ruling ordered court officials in Lowndes County, Ala., to cease excluding Negroes from jury duty, to draw up new jury lists from which Negroes would not be excluded and to make periodic reports to the Federal court giving the name and race of everyone found unfit for jury duty along with a statement of the reasons why each had been turned down.

Lowndes County is not unique in excluding Negroes from jury duty. It is only the most glaring example of a continuing and persistent unconstitutional practice of racial discrimination in the jury selection process in violation of the 14th amendment.

In addition to addressing itself to the problem of racial discrimination in the selection of juries and making it a Federal crime to attack or intimidate civil rights workers, the bill we are introducing today would also permit the removal to the Federal courts for trial of State offenses where it can be clearly shown that a pattern of discriminatory justice exists in the State courts and where such Federal court prosecution is necessary to assure the equal protection of the laws.

The bill would also authorize Federal court injunctions to protect citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights. The Attorney General now has the power to bring such injunction proceedings in voting rights and school desegregation cases. This bill would extend his authority to bring such proceedings to prevent the deprivation of constitutional rights generally.

Another key provision of the bill is one which would provide restitution by the Federal Government to civil rights workers who are injured while lawfully exercising their constitutional rights and make States and counties liable to the Federal Government where police or other local officials are responsible for the injury. This bill would not only recognize the responsibility of government to protect the constitutional rights of its citizens but also its moral obligation to compensate the innocent victims of anticivil rights violence who have suffered physical injury while seeking to vindicate their constitutional rights which the Government is mandated by the Constitution to protect.

There are some, of course, who will call this legislation too far reaching. But the evils of unequal justice and unpunished violence, intimidation, and terror are matters of grave national concern to which the Congress cannot remain indifferent so long as State and local governmental officials persist in defying the plain command of the Constitution.

This bill, which follows closely the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission for new Federal legislation, is essential if all our citizens without regard to race or color in every city and hamlet in our land are to enjoy equal justice and live in freedom without fear of physical violence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am proud to join Senators DOUGLAS, HART, and several of my other colleagues in sponsoring a bill which will, if enacted, close the loopholes which have allowed nightriders and bomb-throwers to escape justice in some of our States.

This legislation will apply to the 50 States. But, it can be no secret that the abuses it is aimed at correcting have been prevalent, for the most part, in our Southern States. And that is primarily where the legislation will have an effect.

First, the legislation will insure that southern juries will be selected from a cross-section of the general population. It will end the practice of excluding Negroes and other minority groups from jury service. It will accomplish this by providing Federal guidelines for jury selection and by applying these guidelines to the State courts, when it is determined that there has been systematic exclusion from jury selection because of race, color, sex, religious, or political affiliation, and economic or social status.

This provision will insure each individual his constitutional right to trial by a jury of his peers. It is designed to provide juries which will take an impartial view of the evidence, especially in civil rights cases, and will not flinch from bringing in a verdict of "guilty" when the evidence warrants such a finding.

The second major provision of this legislation will enable the Federal courts, in certain carefully limited instances, to assume jurisdiction over criminal matters when it is determined that such action is required to insure equal protection under State laws. This provision would apply both to defendants who are not receivng equal justice and to the prosecution of civil rights cases where it is clear that justice cannot be served because of a segregated system of justice.

Finally, this legislation provides machinery for compensating those who have been killed or injured, or who have lost their property by the illegal act of those who have tried to keep dedicated civil rights workers from their lawful activities. A Federal indemnification board would be established, within the Civil Rights Commission. That board would make the initial determination of liability and that determination would be reviewed in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. Further, local and State governments would be made civilly liable for interference with the rights of others, whereas they have previously escaped liability by invoking the doctrine of "governmental immunity."

Mr. President, there may be some who say this legislation goes too far. It does not. This legislation is drafted in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. Moreover, it goes only far enough to put an end to the sorry spectacle of southern juries ignoring the most patent evidence in order to set free murderers, bomb throwers, conspirators, and those who have run the gamut of crimes against civil rights workers and members of minority groups. And it goes only far enough to end the kangaroo courts which have convicted Negroes and civil rights workers on flimsy, sometimes manufactured evidence and then compounded the injustice by invoking exceedingly harsh penalties.

This legislation will go a long way toward translating from myth into reality, the motto which is engraved on the front of the Supreme Court Building across the street: "Equal Justice Under Law."

FRANK E. LIPP

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill, S. 1407, for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1407), for the relief of Frank E. Lipp, which were, on page 1, line 8, strike out "any", and insert "the", and on page 1, line 11, strike out "any", and insert "the".

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). What is the will of the Senate?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, lays before the Senate the pending business, the bill which has just been reported by the Committee on Armed Services, which the clerk will state by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

good-disposition of the Japanese is the greatest asset we have had—and the greatest asset we could have in east Asia. As the greatest industrial complex in the entire Far East, and the only place where today the sinews of modern war could be produced on a formidable scale, Japan is of vital importance to us and indeed to the prospects generally of peace and stability in east Asia. There is no success we could have in Vietnam that could conceivably warrant the sacrifice by us of the confidence and good will of the Japanese people. Yet we abuse that confidence and good will in the most serious way when we press the military struggle in Vietnam, and particularly when we press it by means of strategic bombing.

I mention Japan particularly because it is an outstanding example, both in importance and in the intensity of the feelings aroused, of the psychological damage that is being done in many parts of the world by the prosecution of this conflict, and that will be done in even greater measure if the hostilities become still more bloody and tragic as a result of our deliberate effort. It is clear that however justified our action may be in our own eyes, it has failed to win either enthusiasm or confidence even among peoples normally friendly to us. Our motives are widely misinterpreted; and the spectacle of Americans inflicting grievous injury on the lives of a poor and helpless people, and particularly a people of different race and color, no matter how warranted by military necessity or by the excesses of the adversary our operations may seem to us to be, produces reactions among millions of people throughout the world profoundly detrimental to the image we would like them to hold of this country. I am not saying that this is just or right. I am saying that it is so, and that it is bound, in the circumstances, to be so. A victory purchased at the price of further such damage would be a hollow one in terms of our world interests, no matter what advantages it might hold from the standpoint of developments on the local scene.

These are the reasons, gentlemen, why I hope that our Government will restrict our military operations in Vietnam to the minimum necessary to assure the security of our forces and to maintain our military presence there until we can achieve a satisfactory peaceful resolution of the conflict; and why I hope that we will continue to pursue vigorously the question for such a resolution of it, even if this involves some moderation of our stated objectives and if the resulting settlement appears to us as less than ideal. I cannot, of course, judge the military necessities of our situation; but everything I know about its political aspects suggests to me that General Gavin is on the right track in his suggestions that we should, if I understood him correctly, decide what limited areas we can safely police and defend, and restrict ourselves largely to the maintenance of our position there. I have listened with interest to the arguments that have been brought forward in opposition to his views, and I must say that I have not been much impressed with some of them. When I am told that it would be difficult to defend such enclaves, it is hard for me to understand why it would be easier to defend the much wider areas which expanded hostilities, if successful, would presumably bring under our nominal control. Nor do I understand the argument that our allies will lose confidence in us if we fail to press forward aggressively in Vietnam. In the first place, I am not aware that any serious commentator has been pressing for anything like a total and immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. But even if that were the case, it seems implausible to me that we should suffer much loss of confidence on that account at the hands of a Britain which has wisely and tolerantly liquidated great portions of its former colonial empire since the recent war; of a France which has only recently, in an impressive exhibition of statesmanship, withdrawn from its former North African possessions; or of a Netherlands which, under our urging and encouragement, has had the generosity to give up the great territories in Indonesia. In matters such as this, it is not, in my experience, what you do that is decisive: it is how you do it. I would submit there is more respect to be won in the opinion of the world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than in the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives.

And finally, when I hear it said that to adopt a defensive strategy in South Vietnam would be to rat on our commitment to the Government of that territory, I would like to note what that commitment really consists of and when and how it was incurred. What seems to be involved here is an obligation on our part not only to defend the frontiers of a certain foreign political entity but to assure the internal security of its Government in circumstances where that Government is unable to assure that security by its own means. Now any such obligation is one that goes, obvously, considerably further than the normal obligations of a military alliance. If we did not really incur it in any formal way, then we should not be inventing it for ourselves, and assuring ourselves that we are bound by it, today. But if we did, then I fail to understand how it was possible for us, in entering into any such commitment, to bypass the processes of senatorial advice and consent which were meant to come into play when undertakings of even lesser import than this were entered into.

Now just two concluding observations:

First, I would like it understood that what I have said here implies nothing but the highest respect and admiration for the fighting qualities of our forces in the field. I have the greatest confidence in them, men and commanders alike. I have no doubt that they can and will, if duty requires, produce military results that will surprise both our skeptical friends and our arrogant adversaries. It is not their fighting qualities but the purpose to which they are being employed that evokes my skepticism.

Secondly, let me say that I am not looking at this whole problem from the moral standpoint but from the practical one. I see in the Vietcong a band of ruthless fanatics, partly misled perhaps by the propaganda that has been drummed into them, but cruel in their methods, dictorial and oppressive in their aims. Their claim to represent the people of South Vietnam is unfounded, arrogant, and outrageous. A country which fell under their exclusive power would have my deepest sympathy. And I would hope that this eventuality, at least, can be prevented by our present effort.

But our own country should not be asked, and should not ask of itself, to shoulder the main burden of determining the political realities in any other country, and particularly not in one remote from our shores, from our culture, and from the experience of our people. In saying this, I am only paraphrasing, and very poorly, words once uttered by one who had at one time been a Member of the U.S. Senate and who, had a Foreign Relations Committee existed in his day, would certainly have been a member of it. This was John Quincy Adams, and I would like your permission to recall, before I close, the words of his that I have in mind. They were spoken in this city 145 years ago, on the Fourth of July 1821. Some of you may be familiar with them, but they will stand repeating at this moment.

"Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there," Adams said, "will be America's heart, her benedictions, and her prayers. "But she goes not abroad," he went on, "in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will recommend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and by the benignant sympathy of her example. She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standards of freedom. The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force. * * * She might become the dictatress of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit."

Gentlemen, I do not know exactly what Adams had in mind when he spoke those lines; but I think that, without knowing it, he spoke very pertinently to us, and very wisely.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m., Monday, February 14, 1966.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday, February 14, 1966.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of January 16), 1966:

THE JUDICIARY

Miles W. Lord, of Minnesota, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Minnesota vice Dennis F. Donovan, retired.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Environmental Science Services Administration:

To be commanders

Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders

Francis D. Moran
John W. Bricker
Donald J. Florwick
Sigmund R. Petersen
J. Rodney Lewis
C. William Hayes
Seymour R. Kotler
Darrell W. Crawford
Frederick H. Gramling

To be lieutenants

Carl N. Davis
Edward E. Jones
John E. Dropp
Joseph W. Dropp
Walter F. Forster II
Delwyn C. Webster
Joseph T. Smith
Peter M. Schidrich
Robert C. Westphall
Billy G. Morrison
William R. Klesse
Gerald M. Ward
Woodrow E. Bliss, Jr.
Phillip C. Johnson
Rodger K. Woodruff
James M. Wintermyre
Karl W. Kieninger, Jr.
Karl S. Karinch

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

James P. Brown, Jr.
Richard M. Petryczanko
Leonard T. Lynch, Jr.
William S. Plank
Richard V. O'Connell
Philip L. Richardson
Ralph H. Rhudy
Walter S. Simmons
Frederick G. Paulsen
Jeffrey L. Gammon
Peter K. Reichert
Ellis G. Campbell III
Gary E. Rorvig
Bobby D. Edwards
Donald R. Rich
Marshall A. Levitan
A. David Schuldt
George M. Ensign
George C. Chappell
John P. Vandermeulen