

To be ensigns

Fidel E. Smith
Charles H. McClure
Christopher C. Mathewson
Otto F. Steffin
Carl W. Fisher
Arthur P. Sibold III
John O. Rolland
Phillip F. Dean
Steven M. Erickson
Joseph L. Scott
Lance W. Pape
Glen R. Schaefer
Harold D. Nilsson
Duane D. Helton
Lionel Greve
James L. Murphy
William M. Goodhue, Jr.

William S. Richardson
A. Conrad Weymann III
David L. Sweetland
Gordon P. Dodge
George R. Knecht
Jack L. Wallace
Henry M. Coghlan II
Michael W. Chalfant
Roy K. Matsushige
Richard T. LeRoy
Larry K. Nelson
Arthur D. Ross
Colin L. Campbell
Richard F. Coons
Arthur J. Kuhn
John K. Callahan, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of January 26), 1966:

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35 and sections 8373 and 8376, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

*Brig. Gen. Howard W. Cannon, FV383170, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. J. Clarence Davies, Jr., FV-904230, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Donald S. Dawson, FV582705, Air Force Reserve.
*Brig. Gen. Benjamin W. Fridge, FV365107, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Richard C. Hagan, FV307796, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. William C. Lewis, Jr., FV944440, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. William D. Price, FV286176, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

*Col. Earl O. Anderson, FV705280, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Joseph W. Barron, FV423421, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Richard T. Cella, FV378228, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Stanley J. Czyzak, FV364077, Air Force Reserve.
*Col. Dan B. Dyer, FV2212700, Air Force Reserve.
Col. William R. Harpster, FV662780, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Herman L. Harris, FV344153, Air Force Reserve.
*Col. John W. Hoff, FV828596, Air Force Reserve.
*Col. Joseph S. Hoover, FV907184, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Joe M. Kilgore, FV437412, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Tom E. Marchbanks, Jr., FV669752, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Maurice I. Marks, FV367334, Air Force Reserve.
Col. James L. Murray, FV386624, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Gwynn H. Robinson, FV791240, Air Force Reserve.
*Col. Martin H. Scharlemann, FV402684, Air Force Reserve.
Col. John H. Stembler, FV342806, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Evelle J. Younger, FV391177, Air Force Reserve.

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Joseph P. Gentile, FG384460, Massachusetts Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Raymond A. Fortin, FG420587, Maine Air National Guard.
Col. Roy A. Jacobson, FG2054045, Arizona Air National Guard.
Col. Raymond J. Kopecky, FG740462, California Air National Guard.
Col. Michael C. Maione, FG1849428, New York Air National Guard.
Col. William D. Prescott, FG484947, Pennsylvania Air National Guard.
Col. Valentine A. Siefertmann, FG794707, Hawaii Air National Guard.
Col. Walter E. Williams, Jr., FG766815, Colorado Air National Guard.

(NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates selection by 1963 selection board and submission provided for in section 8373(d), title 10, United States Code.)

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Jack N. Donohew, FR1319 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Thomas B. Whitehouse, FR1677 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Milton B. Adams, FR1712 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Charles R. Bond, Jr., FR1937 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Horace A. Hanes, FR2060 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Thomas K. McGehee, FR3809 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Fred J. Ascani, FR4036 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Robert W. Burns, FR4142 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. James C. Sherrill, FR4910 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Abe J. Beck, FR5831 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Gordon M. Graham, FR7761 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy, FR1631 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. William B. Campbell, FR2000 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. John D. Lavelle, FR4359 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Donald W. Graham, FR4361 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Otto J. Glasser, FR4368 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Duward L. Crow, FR18061 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. William J. Crumm, FR8663 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. John W. Vogt, Jr., FR8709 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Jr., FR8956 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Maj. Gen. James W. Humphreys, Jr., FR19928 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Manson, FR1800 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Robert L. Delashaw, FR1913 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Alvan N. Moore, FR2062 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Ernest A. Pinson, FR3117 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell, Jr., FR4063 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Robert W. Paulson, FR3871 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. John L. Locke, FR4042 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Evans, Jr., FR4072 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Harrison R. Thyng, FR4414 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Richard A. Yudkin, FR4480 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Kenneth C. Dempster, FR4633 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Albert W. Schinz, FR4646 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Frank B. Elliott, FR4681 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Gordon F. Blood, FR4766 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Sam J. Byerley, FR4876 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Edward H. Nigro, FR4889 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Robert F. Worley, FR4906 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William Burke, FR4950 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William C. Lindley, Jr., FR5006 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. John M. McNabb, FR5037 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William B. Kyes, FR5064 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Robert L. Petit, FR5214 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Glen J. McClernon, FR5217 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Thomas N. Wilson, FR5255 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. John L. Martin, Jr., FR7556 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Ralph G. Taylor, Jr., FR8660 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Lee V. Gossick, FR8679 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. James T. Stewart, FR8692 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William H. Reddell, FR8874 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Andrew S. Low, Jr., FR8890 (colonel, U.S. Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Richard D. Reinbold, FR8927 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William C. Garland, FR8934 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Howard E. Kreidler, FR9177 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. George B. Simler, FR9236 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Norman S. Orwat, FR9489 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. John W. Baer, FR9820 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. David C. Jones, FR9887 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William W. Berg, FR9961 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Russell E. Dougherty, FR9985 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Richard F. Schaefer, FR10096 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Charles H. Roadman, FR3379 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Archie A. Hoffman, FR19222 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

U.S. ARMY

Lt. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel III, O18655, Army of the United States (major

February 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A669

³² "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," minority views, Aug. 10, 1965.

³³ Senator NORRIS COTTON, "The Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 26, 1965, p. 21185.

³⁴ "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," minority views, p. 2.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ "L.B.J. Policy Edlet Tied to Hoover," the Washington Post, Aug. 21, 1965.

³⁷ "Top Soviet Intellectuals Castigate United States on Riots," the Washington Post, Aug. 22, 1965.

³⁸ "Consular Convention with the Soviet Union," p. 29.

VN

Move Toward Vietnam Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's effort to continue the peace offensive at the same time that he is protecting our commitment in Vietnam is discussed with great insight and perception in an editorial published in the New York Times last February 3.

The consideration of the Vietnam conflict in the United Nations opens new avenues for discussions and negotiations and brings to bear the prestige and influence of this international organization for a peaceful settlement.

Under unanimous consent I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the Record, believing it to be of broad general interest to my colleagues and to the Nation.

The editorial follows:

MOVE TOWARD VIETNAM PEACE

Despite the mountainous obstacles still to be overcome, the vote to place the Vietnam war on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council provides an opening for international action to move the conflict from the battlefield to the conference table. The formal debate that has been authorized is far less important than the informal consultations now opening to prepare for that discussion.

The objective must be to draft a resolution that can be adopted unanimously or, at least, will obtain a Soviet abstention. Moscow can be expected to use the threat of a veto to influence the shape of that resolution. Yet, there is reason to doubt that the Soviet Union will veto a responsible effort to bring about a negotiated settlement, even though it may feel obliged to stand aside initially.

What would a responsible effort comprise? No one is suggesting that the United Nations enter into the substance of the Vietnam dispute. Hanoi has just repeated its position that Vietnam "falls within the competence of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina, and not of the U.N. Security Council." As Senator MANSFIELD pointed out yesterday, the task now is for other participants in the Geneva settlement to move to reconvene the Geneva powers.

France, as a key participant, has a special responsibility to join with Britain for this purpose, if Soviet reluctance rules out action by the two Geneva cochairmen, Britain and Russia. Nothing in the Geneva accords limits initiatives to the cochairmen. The challenge that faces the United Nations—and, particularly, the African nations that joined France in abstaining yesterday—is to find a

way around the obstacles that block a Geneva meeting.

What are those obstacles? The bombing of North Vietnam is one. But the United States already has suspended that bombing on two occasions. It may be surmised that Washington would not have initiated a United Nations debate were it not prepared to suspend the bombing again, if prospects for a peace conference could thus be improved.

The chief bar to a new Geneva conference is the refusal of Hanoi to participate unless its Four Points are accepted and the United States agrees "to recognize" the Vietcong's National Liberation Front. But Hanoi maintains that the Four Points are nothing but "a concentrated expression of the Geneva accords"—accords the United States supports.

Hanoi's insistence that the Liberation Front is the "sole genuine representative" of the South Vietnamese people has all the outward marks of a bargaining maneuver to obtain maximum status for the Vietcong in the negotiations. The right to attend a reconvened Geneva conference cannot—by this maneuver or any other—be denied to the Saigon Government, which attended not only the 1954 conference but also the one on Laos in 1962. Both groups will have to be represented.

A Security Council resolution could well combine a request for suspension of the bombing of North Vietnam with a proposal that France, Britain and the African members consult the Geneva participants on a way out of the impasse. It could also call upon the International Control Commission in Vietnam to assemble the military commanders of all the combatant forces on the ground in South Vietnam to discuss a cease-fire.

Such a move, if successful, would open direct contact between the major political as well as military forces in South Vietnam—the South Vietnamese Army and the Vietcong. And they undoubtedly would have to discuss a political settlement along with a cease-fire, since the two are inextricably intertwined in any guerrilla war.

A resolution of this type could not be opposed by Washington, which has expressed its willingness to discuss a cease-fire prior to a Geneva conference or as the first order of conference business. It would be difficult for Moscow to veto such a plan, even if Hanoi's reluctance to go to a conference prevents an affirmative Soviet vote.

This is not the only resolution that could help advance negotiations on Vietnam. Now that the United Nations has been brought into the Vietnam conflict, the way is open for fresh minds and the freest exercise of diplomatic ingenuity. Peace is a world responsibility; the U.N. was created to fulfill that responsibility. Vietnam could become its finest hour.

In Your Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the Congress I again introduced a truth-in-lending bill that is designed to protect would-be borrowers or credit users from some of the machinations practiced by moneylenders.

At the present time the borrower is too often victimized by unscrupulous lenders

who engage in wily subterfuge in stating the nature of finance charges and interest rates.

I hope that favorable consideration will be given to my bill H.R. 8332 so that the would-be borrower is dealt with truthfully and honestly by those who lend money or extend credit.

I recommend to my colleagues the following article on lending practices which has been prepared by the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO:

IN YOUR INTEREST: THE NEED FOR THE "TRUTH IN LENDING" BILL

"I recommend enactment of legislation requiring all lenders and extenders of credit to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amount of their commitment and the annual rate of interest they will be required to pay.

"The antiquated legal doctrine, 'Let the buyer beware,' should be superseded by the doctrine, 'Let the seller make full disclosure.'"—President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his message to the Congress, "The American Consumer," 1964.

"Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public. Legislation should therefore be enacted requiring lenders and vendors to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amounts and rates which they will be paying for credit."—President John F. Kennedy, March 15, 1962.

Had any debts lately? Of course you have if you are like most Americans. But do you know how much interest or other financing costs you are paying for those loans and installment purchases?

If you do know, then chances are you are paying only a half or a third as much in financing costs as the person who doesn't know the rate of interest he is paying, according to a recent study. This study showed, for example, that among persons who had taken out loans for \$500 or less, those who were told or took the trouble to find out the true interest rate charged were paying only 12 percent, while those who did not know the rate they were charged, actually were paying 37 percent. Just knowing makes a big difference. Do you?

TRUE RATES

The true annual interest rate isn't always what you think. Do you know, for example, that:

The 3-percent-per-month plan of small loan companies is really 36 percent per year?

The 4½ percent new car financing plan of some commercial banks is really 9 percent per year?

The advertised 5-percent rate on home improvement loans is not less than a 6 percent first mortgage, but nearly twice as much, or almost 10 percent per year?

The so-called 6-percent rate for financing used cars offered by some dealers is at least 12-percent per year and sometimes very much higher—18 to 25 percent per year or more?

The cost of teenage credit now being promoted by some retailers as only "pennies per week" is sometimes as high as 80 percent per year?

Don't feel bad if these facts puzzle you. Another recent study revealed the shocking news that at least 4 people out of every 10 don't know how much they are paying in credit charges. But this study was only of persons with college educations. Probably closer to 8 out of 10 don't know the rates of interest they are paying.

Unfortunately, it is frequently very difficult for you to find out the true cost of what you pay to borrow money or to buy on an installment plan. You know how it goes. You and the family really want that new TV or that late model automobile. By the time you get to looking seriously, you want it and need it right then—not later after you have

taken the time to read the fine print in the sales contract. And the salesman or loan official makes those small monthly payments sound like a "breeze" to repay. Then, after you think, "I must have paid that off by now," and the bills still keep coming, you may wonder how much that purchase really cost in credit charges.

EAGER BORROWERS

Consumer credit has become one of the Nation's biggest businesses. Nearly everybody is a consumer of credit. Long-term consumer debt, primarily in the form of home mortgages, now amounts to more than \$209 billion while short- and intermediate-term consumer debt is \$83 billion, or a total of \$292 billion. This is almost the size of the entire national debt.

What is even more startling is the dramatic rise in consumer debt in the last 20 years. Long-term consumer debt has increased 1,123 percent during that time; short- and intermediate-term consumer debt has increased 1,449 percent, while the national debt has increased by only 18 percent. To make the comparison another way, if the Federal Government had increased its debt at the same rate as the American consumer increased his, the national debt would be nearly \$3 trillion.

Perhaps the most striking figure of all, however, is the interest paid on consumer debt. The interest payments on long-term consumer debt are conservatively estimated at \$11 billion a year, while short- and intermediate-term debts account for at least another \$11 billion a year. Thus, the American consumer, with a total debt slightly less than the national debt, is paying at least \$22 billion a year in interest, or nearly double the annual interest charge on the national debt.

TOTAL OF 229 PERCENT PER YEAR

A U.S. Senate subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, recently held investigative hearings in Louisville, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and Boston to learn the practical effects of borrowers not knowing the cost of credit. These are only a few typical cases which witnesses described to the subcommittee:

A man in Jersey City bought a TV set for \$123.88. He was given a coupon book which called for 24 monthly payments of \$17.50. The interest rate turned out to be 229 percent per year, or more than twice the cost of the TV for interest alone. What is even more tragic, he had to keep up the payments or lose his job.

A housewife on the Lower East Side of Manhattan purchased a couch from a door-to-door salesman for \$300. The payments were set at \$12 every 2 weeks for 2 years. The total interest charge was thus \$324 and the annual rate was 107 percent, although not a word of this was mentioned at the time of the sale.

A New Jersey bus driver borrowed \$1,000 from a small loan company. He was told the interest rate was 4.5 percent. The actual rate turned out to be 29.5 percent, or more than 6½ times the claimed rate. Had the borrower known this at the start, he said, he would have dealt with a lower cost lender.

A similar case occurred in Pittsburgh when a witness testified that he borrowed \$900 from a small loan company and was told that his monthly payments would be \$58.10 for 24 months. The interest rate in this case was 52 percent per year.

Another New York witness bought a television set on credit for 30 months. The interest rate on this transaction turned out to be 143 percent. The committee asked the witness whether she would have signed the contract if she had known the interest rate. The witness replied, "Never in my life."

Testimony before the committee also revealed that Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York were systematically and auto-

matically charged a higher rate of interest, regardless of their individual credit standing.

NOT JUST THE POOR

These examples and hundreds like them have been disclosed which show how not only the poor and the wage earners but salaried, middle class, and very well educated Americans are often misled when they borrow or buy on time. Recent investigations disclosed a very sorry field of deception in the case of college education loans. While Federal education loans are available for 3 percent and various State plans run from 3 to 6 percent, Senators were shocked to learn that some of the private loan plans which are offered to students and parents by our leading colleges and universities involved an interest rate as high as 60 percent per year. Interest rates on "low-cost education loans" frequently ran from 26 to 54 percent a year.

Or consider the facts revealed during a 1965 hearing before the House Banking and Currency Committee about a small-loan finance company which has systematically bilked our American servicemen. This company specialized in auto loans and masqueraded under an official-sounding name as though it were a Government agency. It charged interest rates as high as 100 percent over a 2-year period. It also added an excessive charge for insurance which sometimes didn't even exist.

TRICKS OF THE TRADE

Consumers simply do not know what rate of interest they are being charged on an installment purchase or small loan. This brings terrible and sometimes tragic burdens on people and their families. Most of the blame for this lies not just, or even primarily, in the ignorance of the buyer. The responsibility, as Mr. DOUGLAS' Senate hearings have shown, lies with the confusing practices of the seller.

An economist who is a top executive with one of the largest automobile manufacturing companies once told a Senate committee:

"The variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension. It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates for finance and insurance services offered, as compared with alternatives available elsewhere."

A credit union manager with many years of experience in the lending field vividly described the dilemma of today's consumer. He said:

"The average borrower is caught in a wonderland of credit where percentages multiply and divide at will, where finance charges materialize on command and fees are collected on the way out; where sharp practices and rackets not only inflate the costs of credit, but also impose enormous financial hardships on the debtor, particularly those who can least afford it."

Consider some of the practices used by many lenders which the DOUGLAS subcommittee has uncovered and described after 5 years' study.

No rate quoted

Often no rate at all is quoted to the consumer. This is the simplest and most direct method of obscuring the cost of credit. The borrower is, for example, merely told that he will pay \$10 down and \$10 a month. Neither the total finance charge nor the interest rate is evident. Unless the borrower is a persistent questioner and skillful mathematician, he will not discover the true facts.

The add-on rate

The borrower is told that the finance charge will be \$6 on a 1-year, \$100 loan, repayable in equal monthly installments. The lender represents this to be a 6-percent loan, but such a claim is merely a play on the number 6. The actual rate is almost 12 percent, or nearly double the stated rate, because the borrower is constantly repaying the loan over the year and does not have

the use of the \$100 for a full year. His average debt over the year is only about \$50. In other words, the interest rate is quoted on the original amount of the debt and not on the declining or unpaid balance as is the custom in business credit, government loans, or mortgage transactions. In reality the borrower is asked to pay interest on amounts he has already repaid.

The discount rate

This is a variation of the add-on rate. In the case of the add-on, the borrower receives \$100 in cash or goods and must pay back \$106. In the case of the discount technique, the consumer "borrows" \$100 but only receives \$94. The finance charge again is \$6 and is often represented as being 6 percent interest. Again, the actual rate is slightly more than 12 percent, or twice the quoted rate because the borrower is periodically repaying the loan.

A simple monthly rate

This rate statement method is usually quoted by small loan companies and by retailers using revolving credit plans. The finance rate is represented as being 1, 2, 3, or 4 percent per month. The true annual rate in this case is 12 times the quoted figure, or 12, 24, 36, or 48 percent per year, if the interest is based upon the unpaid balance at the end of each month. If it is based upon the entire original amount of the loan which is being gradually repaid, the simple annual rate is approximately 24 times the quoted figure, or in the illustrations cited 24, 48, 72, or 96 percent per year.

"Loading the camel"

Sometimes lenders compound the camouflage of credit by loading on all sorts of extraneous charges, such as exorbitant fees for credit life insurance and excessive fees for credit investigations, processing, and handling. These charges are a cost of doing business, and should rightfully be figured in with the interest or finance charges. By excluding them in a separate list, the interest rate can be superficially reduced. When these charges are separated from the interest, a comparison of the cost of the credit with other rates becomes impossible. This, of course, could be the purpose of all this sleight of hand in the first place.

Some dealers are even unwilling to use the word "interest." They prefer to call it a "small monthly charge."

TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

The confusion—and subterfuge—which characterizes the world of credit, along with his concern for the effect on the economy of the tremendous growth in consumer credit, led Senator DOUGLAS to propose, with the cosponsorship of many of his Senate colleagues, his truth-in-lending bill. The purpose of the bill is simply to give the consumer the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the charges he is asked to pay when buying on time or taking out a loan.

In brief, the truth-in-lending bill requires that anyone who lends money or extends credit must supply the would-be borrower or credit user with two simple but vital facts:

First: A statement of the total finance charge in dollars and cents; and

Second: A statement of the finance charge expressed in terms of a true annual rate on the outstanding unpaid balance of the obligation.

The bill does not attempt to regulate or control the rate of interest or the cost of credit.

The bill would enable the typical consumer to compare the cost of credit from various sources and make an intelligent decision. It would also assist him in deciding whether or not to borrow, pay cash, or save toward the purchase instead.

Suppose, for example, a man wants to borrow \$1,500 to finance the purchase of a car. Assume he goes to two lenders and the

not hurting our economy. In fact, many people mistakenly feel that we need this as a stimulus. A defense program by its very nature only buys us time. We must use that time to improve conditions and lessen the need for defense. We have the knowledge and manpower to produce equipment and methods to increase agricultural production in all parts of the world, and it is our moral duty to use them.

We have advocated for the past 4 years use of skilled mechanics and operators by the Peace Corps to help operate and maintain equipment to build farm-to-market roads and to increase agricultural production.

I might point out that the UAW will shortly have a Peace Corps auto mechanics program—the very first of its kind—in full operation in Guinea. We expect this to demonstrate that the Peace Corps has just begun to tap the great reservoir of technical know-how waiting to serve around the world where needed.

Our problem is not so much how to accomplish this, but when, or how soon. My answer to that is—the sooner the better.

Over 3 years ago at the World Food Congress here in Washington, I proposed a plan which could easily fit into any new program to step up food production. I proposed six courses of action, which I'd like to enumerate again very briefly.

First, establish regional depots and distribution centers of capital equipment—where tractors, plows, pumps, road machinery, and other equipment to improve food production could be available on short notice and could be properly serviced and maintained. These regional centers could be within a given country or serve nationwide, depending on the geographic circumstances.

Second, I propose regional universities—like our own land-grant colleges—to intensify seed experimentation and other scientific plans for improving farm productivity. This would be done to spread learning throughout the countryside. While there is still suspicion of new ways in many primitive countries, there must be better ways to pass along information to improve productivity.

Third, closely related to this, regional concentration and distribution centers for scientific equipment. As I said to the World Food Congress, "We are separated by only a very thin wall from a breakthrough into a world of plenty no science fiction has ever imagined."

Fourth, we favor regional research centers focusing on the resources and needs of the area. This again is closely related with the other two proposals.

Fifth, a coordinated worldwide effort to utilize wealth locked up in every human being as investment capital. This is really why we are concerned about full employment in the United States and eradicating hunger in the world. People—educated, well-fed people—are the greatest resource of all because it is people who ultimately fashion computers, cranes, bridges, turbines, and all the other wonders of this industrial age.

Sixth and finally, we proposed a commitment by the United Nations and ourselves that the social and economic progress we seek can be accomplished only by a new worldwide agency to help establish free and forward-looking institutions so democracy can prevail.

If we are to be successful in conquering poverty and hunger, there is another important resource we must develop. We have the know-how to split the atom. We will go to the moon. We can conquer disease. But we have not learned to make one drop of water. There is the same amount of water in, on, and around the earth that there has been since the beginning of time. We can change the form, pollute and purify—we

cannot produce water. We must find a way to provide an abundant supply of fresh water in all parts of the world. This in itself can stimulate and increase agricultural production.

President Johnson, speaking to the delegates to the desalinization symposium at the White House on October 7, 1965, said:

"Over various areas of the world today water is the key to man's prosperity or man's poverty—the key to his comfort or his misery. Every 24 hours there are nearly 200,000 more people on this earth. A billion human beings also live on the ragged edge of starvation. Water is a prime necessity, for only if we have water can our growing population ever be fed. Only water can give future generations a chance to escape wholesale misery and wholesale starvation.

"My country, as you know, supports with enthusiasm a continuing food-for-peace program. We support an atoms-for-peace program. We are committed to harnessing the awesome power of nuclear energy for the betterment of humanity.

"And today I want to announce the beginning of a water-for-peace program. Under this new program we will join in a massive cooperative international effort to find solution for man's water problems."

I urge this Conference to endorse this proposal and pledge assistance toward the achieving of these goals.

Any massive program to provide food for hungry people is a target for people whose favorite pastime is to give speeches against spending money. Let me say here and now that the members of the UAW are of a generation which had jobs on WPA, worked in the CCC camps, ate from surplus food boxes, had their children eat school hot lunches, fought in World War II and Korea, and went to school on the GI bill of rights. In spite of all that Government "coddling" and spending, our gross national product has kept growing, and we are all a stronger Nation because of it.

I submit, therefore, that if we want a world where human beings can live full lives, where their bodies grow strong, where there is light and sunshine, where little children can go to school instead of suffering in misery and darkness—then we must face up to the world food crisis.

Since the end of World War II, we have now 20 years of experience in using our resources overseas. We have made our share of mistakes and will make some more. Let's not now turn our backs on the world. Let's not now say it can't be done. Either we conquer poverty or poverty will conquer us.

We know that there are few obstacles in the world today which man's ingenuity cannot master if he sets his mind to it.

We have the land, farm machinery, and technical knowledge to feed additional millions of people. We have the know-how to help other nations develop seeds, fertilizer plants, and insecticides to enormously raise their food output. We should also consider cultivating those crops which are in short supply in the world. The only thing we are not sure about is—Do we have the will to do these things that need to be done?

In the words of a UAW resolution on world peace at our last convention, let me conclude by saying:

"We should not expect the rest of the world to shape itself in the American image. In the struggle for the equality and against poverty we must remember that the world cannot be made according to American patents, or conquered with American advertising slogans. Because the world is hungry both for food and equality, we must join with the people of the world, as coworkers and equals, in a search for a path out of present needs and troubles toward our hopes and visions."

Fighting the War on Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding highlights of the Committee on the World Food Crisis conference on December 9 of last year was the presentation of Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, managing director of the United Nations Special Fund, who outlined the complexities of overcoming the hunger problem existing throughout the world of today.

He praised the expanded program of technical assistance in agriculture of underdeveloped nations and urged renewed determination to speed up the battle against want and the elimination of hunger and the elimination of illiteracy.

For the benefit of my distinguished colleagues who were not in attendance at this excellent program, I include the full text of Mr. Hoffman's remarks:

ADDRESS TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS, BY PAUL GRAY HOFFMAN, LUNCHEON SPEAKER, DECEMBER 9, 1965, WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL

Distinguished Congressmen and Governors, ladies and gentlemen, certainly the first responsibility of a speaker is to cut himself down to size. And I think I can do that best by telling you an anecdote about a grandson of mine who at the time this happened was 5 years old. We were living in California at the time, and he came out, 5 years old I think I said, fully equipped with chaps, two guns and a hat—a real cowboy outfit—and he made himself quite obnoxious running around the house saying, "stick 'em up," which is apparently the kind of teaching we get nowadays from television. At the proposed time to go back home his mother said to him, "Bruce, I think you ought to have a ride on a real horse before you go back home."

He thought that was wonderful, so the next morning he got himself all dressed up again; but as he approached the corral he began to lunge—to quake a little bit, and as the groom lifted him on the horse, he leaned over to him and said, "You know, I'm not a real cowboy, I'm just a little boy from Libertyville, Ill." and that is just the way I feel Senator.

But believing as I do, that there is no task more urgent than feeding the hungry, you'll know how glad I am to be here today, and how encouraged I am by the evidence that there is spreading through America an understanding of the kind of a problem the world is facing. Of the world's 3 billion people approximately 500 million are perhaps overfed, and about a billion are fairly well fed, and about a billion are underfed.

Now those of us who are well fed should be very much concerned about those who are underfed; not only for reasons of compassion, but in this world; this new world of ours, hunger on that kind of a scale is a genuine menace to peace. Now there is nothing new about hunger, the high percentage of people in the world, since history began, have been hungry; perhaps a higher percentage than there is today.

The two new facts that we have to face, one of which has already been commented on by Senator McGovern, is that it is possible today to feed the world's population, because we have had such advances in technology

February 9, 1966

A663

can no longer remain static while the Communists build up new stocks of men and material in South Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson coupled his order to resume bombing with instructions to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to act as quickly as possible to promote peace through the United Nations.

The President's appeal to the U.N. represents a departure from past policy, and indicates that this country will now give more emphasis to convincing the U.N. that Communist aggression in southeast Asia is a world problem, and not one just for the United States alone to deal with.

Heretofore, the administration has welcomed the U.N.'s concern over the Vietnamese war, but it has appeared cool to any suggestion that the U.N. be given a major hand in settling the dispute. Yesterday, however Mr. Johnson called for an immediate meeting of the U.N. Security Council in an effort to bring the Vietnam conflict to the conference table.

It is uncertain what role the U.N. can play. It seems unlikely that a peacekeeping force could be the answer. But there is no doubt that the problem should be before the U.N. for discussion and for the purpose of engendering whatever pressure the free nations may be able to bring to bear upon the Communist aggressors.

It is widely regretted that the 37-day lull found no favorable Communist response to the President's peace efforts and that he found it necessary to resume the bombing.

However, according to Mr. Johnson, his advisers had told him that if continued immunity were given to those who support Vietnamese aggression the cost in American lives would be greatly increased.

"In the light of the words and actions of the government in Hanoi," he said, "it is our clear duty to do what we can to limit these costs."

Although it is regrettable to see the lull in the bombing come to an end, it is clear that the 37-day period—in which Mr. Johnson sought unsuccessfully in many places for a way to end the fighting in Vietnam—has exposed the Communists before the world as the aggressors in southeast Asia.

Their refusal, even to talk about peace, and their denunciations of Mr. Johnson's efforts, have left most people with the impression that peace is the last thing the Communists want.

The resumption of the bombing is consistent with the President's policy of impressing upon the North Vietnamese this country's determination to remain in southeast Asia, while pursuing every path that might lead to peace.

It is not an easy choice in Vietnam for Mr. Johnson—or for the Nation. It is hoped a way will soon be found to end the fighting, but in view of the latest developments it seems the Nation must be prepared to see the situation get worse before it gets better.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal]

L.B.J.'S COMPREHENSIVE OFFERS

Most Americans, and people in other countries as well, must have by this time come to the conclusion there are three choices for the President where the Vietnam war is concerned.

One of these is to pull out all American forces and thereby undermine confidence in our commitments throughout the world.

The second choice would be escalation of the war against the Hanoi regime, with the possibility of finally undertaking a ground war against the Red Chinese.

A third one would be the continuation of the war at its present level from the concentration of troops and airpower that have been built up over the past year.

The third choice presumes a war of indefinite length, for one of its end purposes would be to outstay Ho Chi Minh and his

hard core of Communists who now control the Hanoi regime. He is 75 years of age and, as the saying goes, he can't live forever. Whether he will have hard line successors equally dedicated to communism and anti-Americanism, only time will tell.

Actually, it was reasonably clear, a fact which the President no doubt took into consideration before he launched his "peace offensive," that nothing short of abject surrender would satisfy the Hanoi Communists.

Not every reader has in mind the depth and breadth of the offers the Johnson administration has already made in volunteering to talk with Hanoi without conditions. Following is a summary of what the President has already conceded:

This country wants no military bases in southeast Asia.

The United States does not want to keep troops in South Vietnam, once peace is assured.

Free elections are desired in South Vietnam to give the people a government of their own choice. Reunification of the country can be determined by free decision.

Countries of southeast Asia can be non-aligned or neutral, if that is their wish.

The United States is prepared to contribute to reconstruction in southeast Asia at least \$1 billion in which North Vietnam can share.

The Communist National Liberation Front, or Vietcong, can be represented in talks, once aggression stops.

The reader may well ask what other offer, or reward, could be held out to the Hanoi regime short of complete surrender. The answer seems to us to be that there is not a place for any other decoration on the Christmas tree.

American Labor Movement Joins War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, more than 300 persons from 32 States came to Washington recently to attend the organizational meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis.

One of the best speeches given at that meeting was delivered by Pat Greathouse, a vice president of the United Autoworkers Union.

Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, will start holding hearings next Monday on the world food crisis. On the eve of these hearings on one of the most important matters before Congress, I believe that Mr. Greathouse's excellent speech will be of interest to my colleagues:

SPEECH BY UAW VICE PRESIDENT PAT GREATHOUSE AT CONFERENCE ON WORLD FOOD CRISIS

I am here as a spokesman for the union that makes the tractors, the combines, the haybales, the milking machines, and the trucks that have made American agriculture the marvel of all times. And I am here as a spokesman for the American labor movement, which believes we cannot live on a high hill with good food and housing, surrounded by starving millions upon millions of people.

The world food crisis is here. It is a terrifying day-to-day fact. Other speakers here

today will document what it means in caloric intake per person, to young children, to whole nations, to vast continents. All I can say is that there is no longer any debating of the facts. Worldwide hunger is a desperate, agonizing fact. I am here to say that the UAW and the American labor movement are ready to respond with action, with compassion, and with readiness to serve as hunger fighters in this noble cause to sustain life for all mankind.

The food-for-peace program is more than 10 years old now, and I submit that food for peace has demonstrated in a small way what can be done on a much bigger scale to feed the hungry, to mobilize resources, to help developing countries get on their feet. Food for peace has helped to build railroads, fertilizer plants, schools, hospitals, and agricultural training centers. But now we come to a time in history when we must rethink the dimensions of world hunger, see clearly what our American responsibility is, and then set out to do what needs to be done.

We all know what the faultfinders will say. They will point to the bloopers. Shipments will rot on docks. Road machinery will rust in the jungle. Some high-priced personnel will go astray. These things happen and will happen again. But they are absolutely no argument for putting our heads in the sand and ignoring our responsibilities to the rest of the world.

You know, we've been pretty lucky in this country. We took this huge country, chopped down the trees, cleared its rich land, harnessed its waterways and power, laced it with roads of every kind. Our cities have never been bombed; we've never known mass starvation; and while life has not always been a bed of roses, Lady Luck has been with us most of the time.

Today we are locked tightly in a war many miles away where our sons and our fortunes are being lost in an ever-escalating cost in human lives and money. The war in Vietnam is a tragic conflict for us, for the Vietnamese, and for the world. I mention this now to remind us all that history does not stand still. If we had been willing to invest the time, the money, the very lives that are now spent in war 10 years ago in a worldwide war against want and hunger, who knows—perhaps there would be no war in Vietnam today.

The president of our union, Walter P. Reuther, has said many times, and it always bears repeating, that we must learn to dedicate to the positive cause of peace and brotherhood what we so readily give to the negative cause of war.

I tell you today that it is better for us to send our people overseas armed with tractors and plows, slide rules, welding machines, irrigation rigs, and tool kits—than to draft them to go overseas with flamethrowers, bazooka guns, napalm bombs, and automatic rifles. We in the UAW said this 20 years ago—it is more true today than it ever was.

Some people may say you will raise food prices at home. Others will say we should abandon all farm programs, take off all restraints. Neither is the answer. We can protect farm income at home, and we must. We can do what needs doing without jeopardizing our economy. And we can still give the American consumer bargains in food.

What about the charge we are trying to dump our goods on foreign shores, wipe out or discourage necessary food production in countries with huge food deficits?

Any program to be successful must combine emergency feeding with increased development and production. It was with this in mind that the decade of the sixties was named the decade of development.

We have now reached the point in time where we have the technical knowledge and resources to build any kind of a society we want, barring nuclear war. We are spending over \$50 billion a year for defense, and it is

February 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A661

The aim of freeing Congressmen for legislative activity can be achieved just as well by giving them greater clerical and research help.

The fatal flaw in the President's proposal is that it would remove Federal Government even further from popular control. Congressmen find it difficult enough now to assert their independence of the White House. If Congressmen were elected only in presidential election years, they would be still more beholden to the President.

A popular check on the Federal administration every 2 years is not too often in these days of fast-moving events. Four years would be too long an interval.

The effective Congressman does not fear going to the voters frequently. Part of his job is to know what his constituents are thinking and to inform them how he is voting and why. This activity is not a waste of time, but rather is a positive good.

Two-year terms for U.S. Representatives should be retained.

"Education: The New Frontier for American Business"—An Address by Congressman John Brademas, Sales Executives Club of New York City, February 8, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BRADEMUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of an address I delivered on February 8, 1966, to the Sales Executives Club of New York City on the subject: "Education: The New Frontier for American Business."

The address follows:

EDUCATION: THE NEW FRONTIER FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

(An address by Congressman JOHN BRADEMUS, Sales Executives Club of New York City, February 8, 1966)

I am here today as a practicing politician, one who sits on the committee of the House of Representatives with primary responsibility for legislation in the field of education and, as a member of this committee I have, during the past 7 years talked with college and university presidents, students, and teachers here in our own country as well as in Buenos Aires and Berlin, London and Djakarta, Warsaw, and Moscow.

This experience has given me at least some awareness of the challenges which now confront the schools and colleges and universities of the United States and which therefore confront not only us in Government but you, as leaders of business and industry, as well.

I say "therefore" because it seems to me increasingly clear that the relationships among education and Government and business are growing more intimate in this country rather than less.

Let me make my point by citing some random events of recent days:

1. A few weeks ago John Maynard Keynes appeared on the cover of Time, a posthumous tribute to the new economics which has helped make possible Government policies that are now sparking the greatest business boom in history.

2. Next week Congress celebrates—and I use the word advisedly—the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Employment Act of 1946.

3. Yesterday the House of Representatives passed the cold war-GI bill, which will bring to veterans of Vietnam educational benefits approaching half a billion dollars annually by 1970.

4. Last week President Johnson urged Congress to pass the International Education Act of 1966 and companion measures designed, said the President, "to rid mankind of the slavery of ignorance and the scourge of disease."

5. A Harris poll reported yesterday that 72 percent of the American people believe the country can afford both guns and butter but that if domestic reductions should become necessary, the last two programs to be cut are aid to college education and health care.

6. The titles of two front page stories in last Sunday's New York Times financial section read, "Technology Stirs Search for Profits" and "Electronics and Books: Merger Path," and the Times spoke of the "race for a probable multibillion-dollar prize."

I was not at all surprised then when this week's mail brought me and other Congressmen a printed copy of a recent lecture by President Joseph Wilson of the Xerox Corp. entitled, "The Conscience of Business."

GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS, AND EDUCATION DEPEND ON EACH OTHER

For today, ladies and gentlemen, Government, business, and education are like three men in a boat, and all three depend in significant ways on each other.

I spoke of the challenges which face our institutions of education. Here are just a few:

The landing of Luna 9 makes clear the man's exploration of space, including a visit to the moon, the stuff of science fiction a few years ago, is now within reach.

During our lifetime, man has learned to unleash against his fellow man destructive forces beyond the power of most of us to imagine.

Here at home, one long century after Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, Negro Americans have burst into the national consciousness to insist that our country—and theirs—make real the bright promise of freedom.

Each day's newspaper reminds us of new nations of the world pressing their claims not only for political independence but for a fairer share of the material benefits of the planet as well.

Surely it must be clear that our capacity for coping with these challenges is directly related to the strength and resiliency of our system of education.

PRESIDENTS KENNEDY AND JOHNSON AND 88TH AND 89TH CONGRESSES RESPOND TO CHALLENGES

It was to increase the Nation's investment in education and thereby help respond to those challenges that, with the leadership of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, both the 88th and present Congresses enacted into law a whole series of education bills.

Even a partial recital of the litany of new measures may weary you. The Higher Education Acts of 1963 and 1965, the Vocational Education Act, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Library Services and Construction Act, the State Technical Services Act, the National Defense Education Act and subsequent amendments, the Arts and Humanities Foundation Act, the Historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and all the programs embraced within the war on poverty.

From fiscal 1964 to fiscal 1966, Federal spending on education has soared from \$4.5 to \$8.7 billion, and the expenditures of the

Office of Education have jumped over fourfold in 3 years.

My point here is simple. It is that the Nation is now making and will continue to make an enormous investment in education. But the passage of all these laws by no means solves all our problems.

AMERICAN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY HAS GREAT STAKE IN EDUCATION

Surely American business and industrial community has a great stake in this investment—for at least two reasons. As businessmen, you can see very clearly that the revolution in American education offers remarkable profitmaking opportunities.

As citizens, you have a responsibility for helping our country meet the challenges of which I speak.

I believe that education is, for both these reasons, the new frontier which should command the best genius and enterprise of American business and industry. Let me try to explain why.

I have suggested that education is big business. It is. We now spend about \$40 billion annually for formal education in this country.

Seventeen billion dollars of this amount are spent on purchasable manufactured items; desks, buses, paper, chalk, textbooks, maps, basketballs, cosmetics for school, blackout curtains, slide projectors, shop tools, insurance, toilets, easels, pianos, and globes. Schools are consumers and they consume in almost every area of industrial production.

But there are other substantial if less tangible benefits which education holds for industry.

The progress of the American economy, as of every other sector of our national life, depends in very large measure on education. It is clear that our increasingly sophisticated economy requires an increasingly sophisticated work force. This is one reason I introduced the Technical-Education Bill of 1963, subsequently made part of the Higher Education Facilities Act of that year. The purpose of this bill was to help produce more 2-year college-level, semiprofessional technicians to help our scientists, physicians, and engineers.

Education has long helped the American farmer achieve extraordinary feats of productivity. The land grant colleges and the rural extension programs are the most famous symbols of the contribution of education to economic growth.

With the passage of the State Technical Services Act last year, we hope in like fashion to help make available to American business and industry the latest findings of science and technology. For example, your firm under this new program could arrange with a local university seminars to upgrade your engineers.

All the recent legislation to strengthen colleges and universities and to enable more qualified young people to become students is aimed at producing well-educated men and women, a fundamental manpower requirement for American business and industry.

EDUCATION IS GOOD FOR BUSINESS

Certainly educated men and women mean a better market for business. The high school graduate earns about \$35,000 more during his lifetime than the dropout, and the college graduate earns \$138,000 more than the high school graduate. And as the educational level of the consumer rises, so does his receptivity to new ideas, new products, and new services. We educate to a steadily rising standard of living.

Educational expenditures not only lead to bigger markets for businessmen but also help cut production costs. For example, the better high school preparation young people get in mathematics, science and English, the

February 9, 1966

easier—and more cheaply—they can learn new techniques in on-the-job-training programs.

I think it relevant here to note that a number of modern economists have begun to lay more stress on human as distinguished from physical capital as a contributor to economic growth. Theodore Schultz of the University of Chicago and Edward Denison of the Brookings Institution are among the best known students of this relationship. Both agree that education, as it affects the quality of labor, has been responsible, over a given period, for over 20 percent of the annual rate of growth in the gross national product.

I can tell you by citing only one example—and I could cite many more—that politicians certainly recognize the close link between education and business. I refer to the mad scramble for the Atomic Energy Commission's new 300-bev accelerator. Every Senator and Congressman knows that major scientific installations in his State or district mean better business and more jobs.

So let us agree without my having to offer any more evidence, of which there is an abundance, that education attracts and holds business and industry, creates new resources, and builds new markets; the basic commodity of the civilized world is knowledge and the educator is its retailer. With the greatly increased financial support which government, especially the Federal Government, is now giving education, it is, I think, self-evident that we must develop a triangle of close cooperation among government, business, and education.

And there are hopeful signs. Major corporations seeking to diversify now look to the textbook and educational equipment firms as sound investments. You know the list better than I do.

Private industry, with its long history of productive research programs, has already begun to develop and test teaching machines, data processing, audiovisual and other advanced and experimental teaching equipment and materials for the Nation's schools.

Industry is only now becoming a major contributor to the network linking basic research to new educational tools, equipment to curricula, teaching methods to school organization, preschool training to post-doctoral results.

WHY EDUCATION IS THE "NEW FRONTIER" FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

And all the bills we have been passing in Washington are obviously further stimulus to American business and industry to move more and more boldly into the education market.

But the sudden availability of substantial sums of money to be spent on education is only one of the reasons that education is the new frontier for American business.

You must believe me therefore when I tell you that the best educators of the country are ready for innovation; they want new ideas. You have consumers yearning to be sold and, as I have said, they have the money to buy, much of it Federal.

Indeed, a careful study of the major provisions of the recent education legislation will reveal that Congress, too, shares this desire to encourage new and better ways to teach and to learn. A preoccupation with raising the quality of education at every level runs through the hearings on nearly all these bills. It was, for example, the principal motivation of the Teacher Fellowship bill I authored last year which later found its way into the Higher Education Act and which is aimed directly at improving the quality of education in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools by improving the quality of the teachers.

Congress and the educators of the country not only want more education; they want better education.

Surely this concern to stimulate innovation and quality should spur the spirit of enterprise of American industry.

Another reason the hour is ripe for American business to ride with all flags flying on to the field of American education is the sudden confluence of major social forces making for change: the civil rights movement, the ecumenical movement, the papacy of John 23d, the war on poverty, and an activist, hard-driving President committed to education as has been no other President in American history and supported by strong majorities in both Houses of Congress who share his commitment.

AMERICAN EDUCATION NEEDS EXPERIENCE AND IMAGINATION OF AMERICAN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

I hope that by now I have made clear to you that if war is too important to be left to the generals, education is too important to be left solely to the educators. For to solve the problems that face American education today, we also need the intelligence and experience, the imagination and inventiveness of American business and industry.

Frankly, I believe it would be immensely valuable for those of us in Washington with responsibility to make decisions about education, both in the executive and legislative branches, to consult more often than we now do with you in the business and industrial communities. We need your ideas on how we can attack some of the problems that beset us, and, if I may say so, I would hope that you would not suffer too greatly for having had coffee with a Congressman.

SOME TROUBLESOME QUESTIONS ABOUT AMERICAN EDUCATION

Let me here give you just a sampling of the kinds of questions about American education that are troubling some of us in Congress, questions where we need your counsel and advice and questions which I hope you will consider as you and your firms do your planning for the future—and the future is right now.

These are all questions the answers to which—if there are answers—are likely to lead to profits for business and will surely be to the advantage of the Nation.

In architecture: What are the best kinds of buildings for teaching the children of the poor, for teaching other children? Are there optimum size classes for various teaching conditions? Should we be building playgrounds on rooftops in crowded inner cities?

In teaching: How do you teach the individual child with his individual strengths and weaknesses? How do you discover those strengths and weaknesses? How can a teacher teach a variety of kinds of children in one classroom? When is the best time to introduce children to new fields of study? Are there better ways of teaching the mentally retarded?

Integration: How do you overcome de facto segregation in northern schools? What is the relationship of patterns of Negro mobility to the school systems in big cities?

Poverty: How do you best teach poor children? What kinds of materials? How do you motivate these children? How can you get at the deprivation that extends into the rest of their lives in terms of inadequate food and clothing and housing? How do you reach and teach the parents of the children of poverty?

Vocational education: How do you bring it into line with the manpower needs of today's business and industry. Can we restructure vocational education to appeal more effectively to dropouts?

Materials: What course materials audiovisual aids, are best in enabling children of different ages, backgrounds, abilities, to learn?

Teachers: What is the best way to teach

teachers? How to reeducate them? How to bring new materials and methods to both teachers and administrators? How to recruit good teachers?

Preschool education: Should we undertake a massive investment in preschool programs for all children? only poor children? Do we have enough child-development specialists? Are special buildings and equipment required?

Adult and continuing education: Should we have continuing education programs both to retrain workers in new skills and to enhance the value of their leisure time? What kinds of programs? teaching methods?

International education: What kinds of education can we provide to the underdeveloped countries? What can we learn for American education from educational methods and programs in foreign countries?

There are many more questions I could raise. These are only examples, and perhaps not the right ones. I hope you have others.

But above all, you should be thinking and thinking hard about the best ways to teach and to learn, and you should not wait until tomorrow.

EDUCATION: BOTH A MARKET AND A RESPONSIBILITY FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

For I must reiterate that the new frontier for American business is education.

In the first place, education is a market which should excite and stimulate your profitmaking instinct, a wholly legitimate and nonsubversive instinct.

In the second place, improving American education is a responsibility which, as citizens of a democracy, you should enthusiastically welcome. For I am sure you want to do more than make money. It was that great philosopher of education, Alfred North Whitehead, who said, " * * * a great society is a society in which its men of business think greatly of their functions."

I hope you will think greatly of yours

UN Editorials Say President's Peace Efforts Brand Reds as Aggressors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's peace offensive and the implacable refusal by North Vietnam to discuss peace have exposed the Communists as the aggressors in southeast Asia. This is the substance of a perceptive editorial recently published in the Nashville Tennessean.

The Knoxville Journal in an editorial on January 18 has a telling analysis of the alternatives President Johnson and our Nation face in Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent, I insert these editorials in the Appendix of the Record because of their broad general interest to my colleagues and to the Nation.

The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE MUST STILL BE PUSHED

President Johnson has sent American bombers back over North Vietnam, ending a 37-day lull during which he pushed peace talks around the world. The peace talks will continue—will perhaps be intensified—but the President has decided that the situation

in a nuclear world—then on what matters will it touch?

If the church has nothing to say on these great issues, it has little of significance to say about anything, because these are the crucial issues of our time.

CHURCH VOICES ARE HEARD

Fortunately, voices are being heard within the church of Christ which speak out fearlessly and eloquently to urge the church and Christians as individuals to touch on the "weightier matters of the law."

We hear one such voice in Dr. King who, more than any other American of our time, has moved our country toward realization of the conviction which we vaunt in words: that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

Indeed, I would single out two contemporary developments as the most influential forces shaping the present reawakening of social and political concern on the part of the Christian churches of America.

The first, without question, is the civil rights movement. The Christian churches were a long time awakening to the sin of segregation, but they were stabbed awake by the Negro revolution. Most Members of Congress in 1964 knew full well that the church leaders brought genuine religious commitment—and, I may say, some political muscle—to the battle for civil rights legislation. For the first time in a long time, we heard from the church on a major national issue—and it made a difference.

The other event that shook the world—Christian and non-Christian, Catholic and non-Catholic—was the papacy of John XXIII. Pope John gave new meaning and fresh urgency to the Christian's responsibility for the social and political order. Read his encyclicals on poverty, on race relations, on peace in the modern world, and you will find a spirit speaking with relevance and power to the "weightier matters of the law."

THE CHRISTIAN IN POLITICS

Although I do not advocate Christian political parties and although I find the phrase "Christian politician" suspect as both self-serving and inaccurate, it must be obvious that I believe Christians should get into politics.

For Christians, subject to the limitations of all men, can nonetheless be inspired by the law of love to enter the struggle for justice and be ready, even eager, to use political action as a legitimate weapon (but not the only one) in that struggle. The point is that politics, seen from a Christian perspective, can be a Christian vocation just as much as being a minister or missionary.

May I be bold enough to offer some guidelines to Christians in politics:

1. It is not sufficient to be a good Christian to be effective in politics. You must also be a good politician—that is, know your job.

2. You must have or develop a thick skin. The other day I chanced upon a sermon preached on an election day in Hartford, Conn., by one Nathan Strong. Mr. Strong's admonition to politicians nearly 175 years ago is, I think, worth repeating today:

"A ruler needs religion much more than his unofficered brethren, to support his mind under trials, and to guard him against temptations. When the respectable citizen rises from private into public life, he must expect to exchange quietness for trouble; honor, though alluring, has its bitterness and its dangers; enemies, before unknown, will rise up; the jealous will sift all his actions, and what man can be so guarded as to have his behavior escape censure? The ambitious, thinking him in the way of their own progress, will be his enemies. To support the mind under these evils, and lead it into the exercise of prudence and patience, religion is necessary."

3. All policies, societies, governments, and all politicians are under God's judgment.

None must be absolutized or defiled as incarnating God's will—for none is righteous—no, not one. The Christian in politics will, therefore, always live under tension, always aware that he measures political achievements by standards that require ever greater effort. He can never be satisfied.

4. The Christian in politics must be outgoing and must actively seek justice and combat injustice. I should add, however, that there is no mandate on him to ride at full armor into every battle that comes along. If he does, he will soon deplete his forces and diminish his effectiveness. He must make realistic judgments on when and where to move.

5. The Christian in politics is armed with a unique understanding of human nature. He realizes that man is made in the image of God, yet prideful; he is aware of the role of self-interest in politics, of his own as well as that of others. He knows that, as an active participant in politics, he often will find himself in morally ambiguous situations. But as Dean Bennett said, "Instead of being unnerved by guilt or despair in their midst, Christians do know the experience of receiving grace and forgiveness while they take responsibility."³

It is this forgiving love of God which above all will sustain the Christian in politics as well as in every other work of life.

¹ Quotes from "The Church in a Society of Abundance" by Arthur E. Walmsley (Seabury Press, \$3.95) used by permission of publisher.

² From "What Christians Stand For in the Secular World," as published in Student, 1944.

³ Quote from "When Christians Make Political Decisions" by John C. Bennett, a Reflection Book (Association Press, 50 cents).

U.S. Policy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Rabbi Juda Glasner, spiritual leader of Congregation Mishkan Yicheskel, Sunland-Tujunga, Calif., I insert in the RECORD for the benefit of those who are interested in the debate on U.S. policy in Vietnam, his views as reflected in a recent public statement.

As U.S. prosecution of the war in Vietnam gains momentum, so does debate here in Congress and elsewhere throughout the country and the free world—and, yes, even behind the Iron Curtain where opinion on the Vietnam conflict varies among those representing different ideological factions in the Communist enclave.

I do not think anyone—with the possible exception of the President—expects to reach a consensus on any issue which holds forth such grave and far-reaching ramifications as Vietnam.

While not everyone will embrace Rabbi Glasner's position as their own, he does represent a viewpoint which is shared, either in part or in whole, by a substantial number of his fellow Americans. As one who supports full and open debate on our Vietnam policy, and who believes that all manner of opinion on this criti-

cal issue deserves to be heard, I submit Rabbi Glasner's statement for the benefit of the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY RABBI JUDA GLASNER ON THE VIETNAM WAR

It is with deep concern that we learned about the endeavors of some religious organizations in urging the President of the United States to prevent any escalation of the war in Vietnam if present peace efforts fail. Religious leaders throughout the country are greatly disturbed about this statement since it does not reflect the thinking of the entire Jewish community throughout the Nation.

Many religious leaders, including myself, believe that our primary task is to foster religion and to safeguard the religious way of life. In pursuing this objective we could serve our country much better by limiting our activities to the promotion of these spiritual and moral goals. In offering advice to the authorities whose responsibility it is to conduct the affairs of our country, we are intruding into a field in which we do not have sufficient background of knowledge and experience. The President and his Cabinet are eminently qualified to weigh the pros and cons of this grave situation and to determine which course of action will best serve the interest of our Nation.

Any statements from religious organizations suggesting policies to our Government are beyond the scope of such religious organizations and will only emasculate the efforts of our Government to win peace with honor and dignity.

We believe that we need to embark upon a program designed to rally around our Government in support of those endeavors which will promote peace with justice and secure our own freedom as well as that of other nations.

Retain Popular Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, since the President expressed his support for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives, there has been considerable discussion on this subject.

This is, of course, a complicated question. I recognize the value of the 2-year term and the desirability of keeping the House responsive to the people of the Nation. The following editorial from Paddock Publications, Inc., Arlington Heights, Ill., publishers of 16 suburban newspapers, presents a forceful argument in favor of retaining the 2-year term:

RETAIN POPULAR CONTROL

Attention has been focused on the role of Congress as the result of President Johnson's proposal to elect U.S. Representatives for 4-year terms, the election to take place during presidential election years.

The chief argument for the change is that it would free Congressmen from frequent reelection campaigns and therefore give them the time and peace of mind needed to become more effective legislators.

This sounds good in a text-bookish sort of way. But a second look at the proposal reveals it would do more harm than good.

Men who are good legislators will be good no matter how long their terms, and those who are bad won't be cured by giving them longer tenure. Perhaps they would become even worse.

February 9, 1966

life." This means that our religious faith must touch every dimension of man's existence—social, economic, and political as well as private and individual.

If this is true, we must then have a specifically Christian perspective on responsibility for action in the political order. Surely one of the reasons Christians have such a difficult time coming to grips with politics is that they lack a perspective which is intellectually honest, theologically consistent, and realistic in the world.

Some Christians suggest—in a kind of sentimental, utopian way—that if only all men were to become Christians, we would be able to resolve the many social and political problems that afflict mankind. But even if we were all Christians, there would still be Republicans and Democrats, business and labor, black and white. We still would have problems, for there still would be conflicts of geography, of interest, of viewpoint.

DILEMMA OF RELATIONSHIPS

The core of the dilemma, as I view it, is that many Christians do not understand how they can relate the law of love to the world of politics. On the one hand, they see Christian love, agape, represented by Christ on the cross—utterly self-sacrificing, self-giving, other regarding love. On the other hand, they see the calculating world of politics, where "accommodation," "negotiation," and "compromise" are the words we characteristically use to describe what happens, for example, in a Congress composed of 435 Representatives and 100 Senators, working with or against one President—not to mention the other participants in the governmental process. Yet these are precisely the words which we ought to use if we want to get something done.

But many Christians view these seemingly irreconcilable realms of religion and politics—of the selfless Christ on the cross and the horse-trading Congressman—and conclude that there can be no link, that the two worlds can have nothing to do with each other.

Let me put the same point—that never the twain of politics and religion can meet—another way in the words of Arthur E. Walmsley, an executive of the Protestant Episcopal Church whose field is Christian citizenship. Writing in "The Church in a Society of Abundance," he says:

"In the new era, decisionmaking takes place increasingly within the context of ever larger structures: the modern corporation, the automated industry, the welfare state—group settings in which decisionmaking by teams or task forces reduces individual accountability to a minimum.

"How," he asks, "is power to be exercised responsibly in this setting? Traditional approaches of personal accountability, as expressed in the Protestant ethic, fail to come to grips with the nature of structure and context of the new era. * * * The humanization of the social order does not reduce itself, in situations such as this, to the categories of Christian love."

Christians, sensing the extraordinary complexity of the modern age, notes Walmsley, look with nostalgia to a simpler era when men made most of their important decisions face to face, and felt a sense of personal choice and personal accountability.

But we live in a different time, in a more vast and complicated society, where men's lives are determined in large measure by powers and principalities—corporations, government, unions—rather than by their next door neighbors or the family who lives down the road a piece.

What, then, has the law of love—of utterly un-self-regarding love—to say to such a world, to a President or a Congressman?

Does it say to withdraw? Does it say we must reject making decisions about the use

Footnotes at end of speech.

of power in such a world? My answer is "No." My answer is that there is a link between the law of love and the practice of politics, a concept which relates the two. That concept is justice.

The concept of justice varies in human history, but I suggest that at the very least justice means guaranteeing to every man his due, assuring that he gets what is coming to him—what he is entitled to as a man.

JUSTICE IS NOT LOVE

Now justice is not the same as love. Love does not count or reckon—but justice does. Justice must be calculating. It is not love, therefore, but justice that should be the immediate objective of political action.

As Walmsley says, "The balance of the rights and responsibilities of one group against those of another involves issues of justice." This "balance of rights and responsibilities" of competing groups, of course, is the very stuff of politics. Justice, then, is not a hand-me-down kind of concept.

"Justice seen in this light," Walmsley declares, "is not a crude approximation of love but the means by which the Christian cooperates with the will of God precisely in the midst of life."

As Theologian Reinhold Niebuhr puts it, "justice is the instrument of love."

And as the late William Temple said: "Associations cannot love one another; a trade union cannot love an employers' federation, nor can one national state love another. The members of one may love the members of the other so far as opportunities of intercourse allow. That will help in negotiations; but it will not solve the problem of the relationships between the two groups. Consequently, the relevance of Christianity in these spheres is quite different from what many Christians suppose it to be. Christian charity manifests itself in the temporal order as a supernatural discernment of, and adhesion to, justice in relation to the equilibrium of power."

Look at the greatest issue of our time here at home, civil rights and listen to Martin Luther King:

"I'm not asking for a law to make the white man love me, just a law to restrain him from lynching me."

Listen to the language of legislation: parity for farmers, equitable tax laws, fair labor standards—and we hear echoes of the concept of justice.

Is love then irrelevant to political action? No. On the contrary, it is our love for our fellow man—commanded us by Christ—that generates in us a concern that our fellow man be treated justly. Love is the force that motivates our commitment to justice.

So we now have in the concept of justice, I believe, a link that binds together the worlds of Christian faith and political action—and does so in an intellectually honest, theologically consistent and realistic way.

MEN ARE SINNERS

Let me turn to yet another reason beyond the love commandment which imposes on us as Christians a religious responsibility to strive for justice among men.

It is that men are sinners—that men, you and I, tend to put ourselves rather than God at the center of life.

This is, of course, simply another way of stating the doctrine of original sin. It is this doctrine, rather than the idea that man is naturally good, that is the unarticulated view of human nature on which most politicians—at least the successful ones—proceed.

This is not, I must emphasize, a cynical view, not one that declares men are evil through and through.

You may recall Machiavelli's comment: "Whoever organizes a state and arranges laws for the government of it must presuppose that all men are wicked and that they will not fail to show their natural depravity

whenever they have a clear opportunity, though possibly it may be concealed for a while."

Not so, for to paraphrase Niebuhr: Men are good enough to make democracy work. Men are bad enough to make democracy necessary.

It is in part this more skeptical but uncynical view of human nature that caused the Founding Fathers to write into the fabric of our American Constitution a system of checks and balances. We do elect Members of Congress and entrust them with certain powers, but for only 2 years. And even Senators of the United States are required to have their credentials reviewed every 6 years. The President has the veto power, but he can be overridden. Men are good enough to make democracy work but bad enough to make democracy—with all its checks and limitations on the rulers—necessary.

It is this propensity of men to injustice—to unwarranted self-seeking—that is a chief purpose of political action to curb and channel while at the same time promoting a wider degree of justice, a fair share for all men.

I do not say that all political questions can be resolved readily into simple issues of justice or injustice, for many problems facing government are primarily technical in nature, requiring expertise and know-how.

Nor do I say that all political issues have two equal sides although sometimes, as with civil rights, there is clearly greater weight on one side than the other.

THE POLITICIAN'S TASK

In my view, it is the task of the politician to seek in the given circumstances—with all the skill and imagination he can muster—the greatest measure of justice for all concerned.

I believe Christians have a particular obligation to seek justice for the disinherited. As Dean John C. Bennett of Union Theological Seminary has said, "Christ himself concentrated on the people of greatest need, the people whom respectable society neglected or despised." It is this aggressive caring for the people who cannot defend themselves which is essential when the Christian makes political judgments. It is, I suggest, at least one of the major motivations behind the present war on poverty.

The disinherited are now being heard both at home (witness the Negro revolt) and in the developing nations of the world. Paternalism will not do as an answer to this cry.

I have said that all men's lives are today immensely influenced by what governments do, and that Christians have a religious responsibility, motivated by love, to seek justice for their fellow men. I conclude, therefore, that if the church of Christ is to say anything to men today, it must speak to them not only in their individual and family capacities but also to the social, economic, and political dimensions of their existence.

Niebuhr tells the story of how, at the beginning of this century, the late Bishop Charles Williams of Michigan was approached by a young clergyman with a plan for organizing a Christian layman's league. Learning that the league's chief objective was to close all movie houses on Sunday, the bishop said, "I should think that could wait until you have solved the weightier matters of the law."

Niebuhr warns that: "The church, as does every other institution, sinks into triviality when it fails to deal with the weightier matters of the law, particularly the law of love or the basic concern of the self for the neighbor."

If the Christian church today fails to touch on the "weightier matters of the law"—on the outrageous treatment of Negroes in both North and South, on the paradox of poverty in the richest Nation in human history, on the slums still festering in our great cities, on the problems of devising a tolerable peace

The declaration that we have always opposed the war, is true or false, accordingly as one may understand the term "opposing the war." If to say "the war was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President" be opposing the war, then the Whigs have very generally opposed it. Whenever they have spoken at all, they have said this; and they have said it on what has appeared good reason to them. But if, when the war had begun, and had become the cause of the country, the giving of our money and our blood, in common with yours, was support of the war, then it is not true that we have always opposed the war. With few individual exceptions, you have constantly had our votes here for all the necessary supplies.

And, more than this, you have had the services, the blood, and the lives of our political brethren in every trial, and on every field. The beardless boy, and the mature man—the humble and the distinguished, you have had them. Through suffering and death, by disease, and in battle, they have endured, and fought, and fell with you.

The Chicago Times—not to be confused with the present-day Chicago Sun-Times—of June 23, 1858, charged that Mr. Lincoln had voted against a bill appropriating money for the purchase of medicine and the employment of nurses for Mexican War veterans. The following day Lincoln wrote from Springfield to Henry C. Whitney:

Give yourself no concern about my voting against the supplies, unless you are without faith that a lie can be successfully contradicted. There is not a word of truth in the charge.

On June 25 Lincoln went into detail about his votes in a letter to Joseph Medill, one of the Chicago Tribune's two co-publishers:

I was in Congress but a single term. I was a candidate when the Mexican War broke out—and I then took the ground, which I never varied from, that the administration had done wrong in getting us into the war, but that the officers and soldiers who went to the field must be supplied and sustained at all events.

When I came into Congress, money was needed to meet the appropriations made, and to be made; and accordingly on the 17th day of February 1848, a bill to borrow \$18,500,000 passed the House of Representatives, for which I voted.

"Again, on the 8th of March 1848, a bill passed the House of Representatives, for which I voted. * * * The last section of the act * * * contains an appropriation of \$800,000 for clothing the volunteers.

"You may safely deny that I ever gave any vote for withholding any supplies whatever, from officers or soldiers of the Mexican War.

The first debate with his famous rival, Senator Stephen A. Douglas, was held at Ottawa, Ill., August 21, 1858. Douglas, referring to Lincoln, said:

Whilst in Congress, he distinguished himself by his opposition to the Mexican War, taking the side of the common enemy against his own country.

Here is Lincoln's reply to the charge:

I think my friend, the judge, is * * * at fault when he charges me at the time when I was in Congress of having opposed our soldiers who were fighting in the Mexican War. * * * Whenever the Democratic Party tried to get me to vote that the war had been righteously begun by the President, I would not do it. But whenever they asked for any

money, or land warrants, or anything to pay the soldiers there, during all that time, I gave the same votes that Judge Douglas did. * * * When he, by a general charge, conveys the idea that I withheld supplies from the soldiers who were fighting in the Mexican War, or did anything else to hinder the soldiers, he is, to say the least, grossly and altogether mistaken.

While engaged in the fourth debate with Senator Douglas at Charleston, Ill., September 18, 1858, Mr. Lincoln turned to the crowd on the platform and selected Orlando B. Ficklin, led him forward, and said:

Mr. Ficklin * * * was a Member of Congress at the only time I was in Congress, and he knows that whenever there was an attempt to procure a vote of mine which would indorse the origin and justice of the war, I refused to give such indorsement, and voted against it; but I never voted against the supplies for the army, and he knows, as well as Judge Douglas, that whenever a dollar was asked by way of compensation or otherwise, for the benefit of the soldiers, I gave all the votes that Ficklin or Douglas did; and perhaps more.

You know they have charged that I voted against the supplies, by which I starved the soldiers who were out fighting the battles of their country. I say that Ficklin knows it is false.

There is of course no parallel between the origins of the Mexican and Vietnamese wars, as the latter conflict was already in progress when Lyndon Johnson assumed the Presidency. Just as the Whigs of over a century ago joined the Democrats in voting the necessary funds and supplies for the war with Mexico, so will the Republicans of today join with their Democratic colleagues in voting whatever is necessary for fighting the war in Vietnam to a victorious conclusion.

"Christian Responsibility in the Political Order"—An Article by Congressman John Brademas, of Indiana, Together Magazine, December 1965

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most thoughtful article concerning the relationship between the Christian faith and political action. The article, which appears in the December 1965 issue of Together, a publication of the Methodist Church, was written by our distinguished colleague from Indiana, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS.

Congressman BRADEMAS, himself a Methodist, spoke on this same subject earlier this year at the annual service in honor of Members of Congress at the Cleveland Park Congregational Church in Washington, D.C.

The text of Congressman BRADEMAS' article, "Christian Responsibility in the Political Order," follows:

CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY IN THE POLITICAL ORDER

(By JOHN BRADEMAS, Congressman, Third District, Indiana)

It is less necessary than it once was to persuade Americans of the importance of politics in the modern world. We live, whether we like it or not, in a time when the lives of all of us are touched in some important way by the actions of government. Moreover, because of our country's immense power, the lives of millions of people all over the world are affected significantly by decisions of the officials in our Government.

I represent a congressional district in northern Indiana with nearly a half million people, and the problems they bring to my office typify the broad impact of government today: Social security and veteran's pension cases, small-business loans, defense-contract problems, manpower-retraining projects, new post offices, immigration bills.

Nearly 2 years ago, I experienced firsthand the ways in which the resources of the Federal Government can be mobilized to meet a crisis that directly touches the lives of thousands of people in a local community. I represent the district in which the Studebaker automobile plant was shut down, throwing several thousands of people out of work and creating serious human hardships as well as economic distress. But we were able to bring together assistance from an extraordinary variety of Federal agencies—and not even the local chamber of commerce was decrying Federal aid 2 years ago in South Bend, Ind.

We know, of course, that Government plays a most important role in the economy of every modern country. Two world wars, a depression, the cold war, and the general acceptance of the welfare state are the principal reasons for the vastly increased importance of government in the United States. A year ago I traveled extensively in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia, all Communist nations, where nearly the entire economic effort is under government direction. And in the world's newly developing nations, government is often the focal point not only of economic planning but of nearly every important decision that is made in the entire society.

My point is simple: in modern societies in nearly every part of the world, big government is here to stay.

But if government is an increasingly important factor in the lives of people, it is imperative, at least in a society that claims to be free, for government to be the servant, not the master of the citizens. And in a free society this means recognition of the central—and legitimate—place of politics, of competition and conflict, of struggle for control of power which government is.

Surely then, there can be no denying the significance of government. Similarly, most of us can give at least tacit assent to the proposition that every citizen in a democracy has some obligation to participate in politics.

OUR CONCERN AS CHRISTIANS

The essential question for us as Christians, however, is this: why should we be concerned about politics, about government? Is there a religious responsibility incumbent upon Christians for action in the political order?

Some say no, that the Christian as an individual and the Christian church as an institution must stand aside from the hurly-burly of politics. Separation of church and state, they argue, is the same as separation of politics from religion.

I strongly disagree with this contention. Moreover, I often find it a thinly disguised argument for maintaining the status quo. I am profoundly afraid of preachers who never preach on anything but how to find personal happiness. The theme of the great World Conference of Christian Youth in Oslo some years ago was "Jesus Christ: Lord of All

Here is a clear statement of the facts on an issue of vital concern to us all and, because many will want to read and study this editorial, I herewith submit it for publication in the RECORD:

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Feb. 2, 1966]

THE STORY OF 37 DAYS

Something of a mantle of sadness, of resignation, but no doubt of understanding and, perhaps even of pride, must have settled upon the Nation when first President Johnson, then Secretary of State Rusk, explained why we have resumed bombing of strategic targets such as supply lines in North Vietnam.

What they told was the story of 37 days. It is a story unprecedented in the history of mankind.

No matter what went before, no matter if or how much we erred in the past, the story of 37 days is an epic of a great, outgoing search for peace at any price short of abject surrender and flight.

And the fact that strategic bombing has been resumed is not the end of the story of 37 days.

On the contrary, it is a continuing story; it is being pressed dramatically through the United Nations; it gets its power from a dictum of unmistakable clarity, expressed by the President in such phrases as "We have made it clear there are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace * * * our decision to stand firm has been matched by our desire for peace."

What is the story of 37 days?

It is the story of how we suspended bombing in North Vietnam to prove our devotion to peace, despite evidence that Hanoi was using the pause to beef up its infiltrating forces.

It is the story of how we sent 6 of our best diplomats to 32 capitals of the world to explain our cause and our goal, and why it is also their goal.

It is the story of how we contacted 115 governments in all, plus NATO, plus the Organization of American States, plus the Organization of African Unity, plus the Vatican; and of how we met with understanding and support from the great majority.

It is the story of how we kept a check with scores of governments and groupings of governments to see if Hanoi had made even the tiniest of responses. It had not. Only insults.

It is the story of how the President repeated again and again, in only slightly different language, that we were willing to sit down anywhere, anytime, with anybody to discuss peace, with or without a pause in the fighting.

The story of 37 days is a satisfying story, if a sad one.

But it is a great story for what it has shown.

It has shown that Hanoi will listen to no peace bids of any sort.

It was imperative that this be determined. Hanoi has rebuffed direct American pleas. Rebuffed pleas from nonaligned nations to negotiate.

Rebuffed the Vatican.

Rebuffed pleas from nonaligned nations to negotiate.

Rebuffed pleas from India to negotiate.

Rebuffed pleas from the United Nations (as Hanoi had as far back as 1964 when Russia asked Hanoi to come before the Security Council).

Its answer has always been the same: The United States (and presumably allied forces aiding the South Vietnamese) must get out of Vietnam first; then there must be recognition of the Vietcong as the sole bargaining power from the North.

Those stipulations are inhumane and unnecessary.

They are inhumane because they spell mass slaughter of South Vietnamese, and impose communism on South Vietnam without a vestige of democratic process.

They are unnecessary because the United States, even as the United Nations, is committed to permitting any nation to decide its political future as long as this is done by free and bloodless election. And we have said we will talk with the Vietcong.

The story of 37 days has not been in vain.

We have gained allies, we have made our cause clear, we have proved that peace cannot be unilateral.

Whatever happens now, the story of 37 days stands in our favor. We can do no more than what we have done and are now doing.

Wasted Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, representing as I do a Chicago area district, I found our metropolitan papers devoting considerable space in the past year to the trial of Drs. Ivy, Phillips, and Durovic in the Krebiozen matter.

It is unfortunate that this long expensive trial has still not answered the fundamental question of the value or importance of this drug.

The Suburban Economist, in an editorial on February 6, emphasized this point of view in a most practical fashion:

WASTED EFFORT

After a trial in Federal court lasting 9 months in local history, the most important issue still remains unsolved.

That issue is whether Krebiozen has any merit in the treatment of cancer.

The four defendants were tried on charges of using the mails to defraud, submitting false statements to the Government, violation of the Food and Drug Act, and refusal to permit a laboratory inspection.

Although 178 witnesses testified, the jury was not asked to decide whether the drug itself was a fraud. Certainly during the 9 months that issue could, and should, have been explored. Of course, some witnesses testified the drug relieved or cured them of cancer, other witnesses, principally Government personnel, testified the defense witnesses did not have cancer or that surgery ultimately effected a cure.

As a consequence, the acquittal of Drs. Andrew Ivy and William F. P. Phillips and the Durovic brothers is not surprising. The world is hoping and praying for a cure for the scourge ailment, and the average person believes any effort to find that cure should be encouraged instead of being tied to redtape regulations.

A suspicion also prevailed that a fortune awaits the discoverer of a cure and that certain interests were more concerned in sharing in such a gain in developing the drug, just as the original biotics were improved through use and further experimentation.

Now that the costly trial is over, with great financial loss to the Government and defendants, the Food and Drug Administration or some other suitable Federal Agency should begin at once whatever tests and research are necessary to not only determine the worth of Krebiozen, but also to improve upon it if possible.

The original Salk vaccine against infantile paralysis and the original vaccines against diphtheria and other diseases were improved upon after being first introduced.

Lincoln and the War With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, over a century ago, a great American who had opposed our entry into the war with Mexico did all he could, not to obstruct the war effort, but to aid in its successful prosecution toward victory. Abraham Lincoln disagreed with President James Knox Polk, but as a Member of this body he voted for whatever was necessary for the support of the war.

In these critical days, when so many—but by no means all—of the civil rights leaders are making common cause with those who are hindering our war effort, the words of the Great Emancipator are well worth reading.

On February 1, 1848, in a letter to his law partner, William H. Herndon, Congressman Lincoln wrote:

I have always intended, and still intend, to vote supplies; perhaps not in the precise form recommended by the President, but in a better form for all purposes, except loco-foco party purposes * * *. The Locos are untiring in their effort to make the impression that all who vote supplies, or take part in the war, do, of necessity, approve the President's conduct in the beginning of it; but the Whigs have, from the beginning, made and kept the distinction between the two. In the very first act, nearly all kept the distinction between the two. In the very first act, nearly all the Whigs voted against the preamble declaring that war existed by the act of Mexico, and yet nearly all of them voted for the supplies.

Mr. Lincoln wrote another letter to his partner June 22, 1848, in which he discussed the subject further:

You ask how Congress came to declare that war existed by the act of Mexico. * * * The news reached Washington of the commencement of hostilities on the Rio Grande, and of the great peril of General Taylor's army. Everybody, Whig and Democrat, was for sending them aid, in men and money. It was necessary to pass a bill for this. The Locos had a majority in both Houses, and they brought in a bill with a preamble, saying—whereas war exists by the act of Mexico, therefore we send General Taylor men and money. The Whigs moved to strike out the preamble, so that they could vote to send the men and money, without saying anything about how the war commenced; but, being in the minority they were voted down, and the preamble was retained. Then, on the passage of the bill, the question came upon them, "shall we vote for preamble and bill both together, or against both together." They could not vote against sending help to General Taylor, and therefore they voted for both together.

Representative Lincoln addressed the House of Representatives on July 27, 1848. The following paragraph concerns the Mexican War:

North Vietnamese uniforms. But almost every expert on this war—in Saigon and Washington—agrees that the initial revolt in 1958 was spontaneous. It was Communist-led, to be sure, and received moral support from North Vietnam and China. But it was South Vietnamese revolt. Today, of course, it is being sustained by Communist China and North Vietnam with arms, trained cadres, and since last year, with regular troops from the North Vietnamese army. There is some evidence that Ho Chi Minh joined the conflict with a certain reluctance, but like our own government found it difficult to extract himself without losing face. It is simpler, of course, to say that the whole revolt of the Vietcong was planned and executed according to orders from Hanoi or Peiping. The Communists do not have a lock on the good guy versus bad guy theory of history.

Meanwhile, the war is stepping up. The Vietcong is now drafting young men with the same brutal press gang methods used by the Vietnamese Government. The area of battle is widening.

We may have a half million American troops here before the year is out, and some people think the number will rise to a million by the next Presidential election. The napalm is skidding across the mountains, villages are burning, schools are being bombed and young men are dying.

Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that Caterpillar Tractor Co., whose home office is in Peoria, has announced that 75 percent of its \$607 million in sales outside of the United States were products exported from American plants. This will result in a \$461 million improvement of the Nation's balance-of-payments problem. The company also reports that for the 10-year period 1956-65 the net contribution of Caterpillar was \$2.9 billion.

This is an impressive achievement, which underlines the necessity of mutually advantageous international trade. Foreign nations use dollar earnings from their exports to increase their purchases of American-made equipment. The healthy flow that results from this exchange contributes to new markets and greater profits for industry, more employment opportunities for the workingman, and an increasingly stronger balance of trade surplus for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the article, Peoria Journal Star, February 4, 1966, that reports Caterpillar's contribution toward easing our balance-of-payments problem follows:

CAT AIDED BALANCE BY \$461 MILLION

More than 75 percent of Caterpillar Tractor Co.'s \$607 million in sales outside of the United States were products exported from American plants, the company reported yesterday.

Primarily as a result of this, the company said that it helped to improve the Nation's balance-of-payment problem by \$461 million last year.

The company's contribution, its largest for a single year, was 20 percent more than the

\$373 million contributed in 1964, according to Caterpillar President William Blackie.

For the 10-year period 1956-65, the net contribution of Caterpillar, the largest private employer and industrial exporter in Illinois, was \$2.9 billion.

Blackie noted that Caterpillar has been cooperating with the Federal Government in its request that major exporters and firms with substantial investments abroad try to improve their net contributions to a more favorable balance of payments.

In an effort to maximize its own balance of payments, he said, Caterpillar began building facilities abroad in the early 1950's. These have contributed materially to an increase in exports from the United States because products manufactured abroad use substantial quantities of U.S.-built components, Blackie said.

Arrows and Olive Branches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times, on February 1, accurately analyzed the course of events which required the resumption of U.S. bombings in North Vietnam. The Times has consistently demonstrated a responsible attitude toward the President's policies in Vietnam. Their editorials have reflected the sentiments of an overwhelming majority of Americans that we must continue to be firm in our resistance to Communist aggression while always remaining ready to negotiate a peaceful solution. The Times' admonition that there are "just no easy answers" to the present crisis is a sound one and it is my hope that this reality will be accepted by my colleagues as we undertake to formulate national policy in southeast Asia.

The editorial follows:

ARROWS AND OLIVE BRANCHES

The U.S. bombing of North Vietnam has resumed after a pause of 37 days, during which time the American effort to sound out Hanoi on mutual steps toward de-escalation met with total failure.

Indeed, even if the bombing suspension had lasted 37 weeks, it is doubtful whether the Communists would have given any concrete indications—not necessarily an agreement to negotiate—that they were prepared to diminish the tempo of the war.

Secretary of State Rusk said yesterday that Hanoi had been told the United States was willing to continue the bombing pause if some quid pro quo were offered. Ho Chi Minh gave his answer the other day when he called U.S. peace overtures an "impudent threat."

In the face of such intransigence, both military and political needs dictated a resumption of the air raids. The future course of events may in fact require an expansion of the air war. This is for the Commander in Chief and his military advisers to determine.

Meanwhile the United States will continue to pursue diplomatic steps aimed at securing a reduction in the level of confrontation or in bringing about talks to end the war.

The first move is scheduled at a U.N. Security Council meeting today, called at U.S. request. Recourse to the United Na-

tions at this time, however, is somewhat puzzling, particularly since both U.S. and U.N. spokesmen have recently made it clear that no practical role in the Vietnam issue is seen at this time for the world body.

Quite probably the U.N. move, along with other continuing diplomatic initiatives, is intended to demonstrate that even while the war goes on, the United States remains prepared to talk peace. There is nothing mutually exclusive in pursuing both the military and political paths, nor anything dangerous, so long as the military effort is not compromised in any way by false hopes about what the Communists are willing to do.

It must be recognized, though, that prospects for a political settlement at this time are slim indeed.

The Communists have been told with no ambiguity that they will not be permitted to gain by negotiations what they are trying to gain by force, control of South Vietnam. Continuing military pressures, in the air and on the ground, may eventually convince them they can't win by fighting. This conviction won't necessarily propel them to the conference table.

The domestic debate on Vietnam meanwhile goes on. Liberal critics of the administration's policies have not been silenced by the bombing pause, but in Hanoi's response they at least were answered. Nor will more belligerent critics—particularly those who see air power as the answer to everything—be silenced or satisfied by the limited resumption of bombing.

What this means is that Vietnam as a political issue will be very much with us this year, and perhaps for some time to come. The dangers of demagoguery on both sides are great. Perhaps the best standards of judgment for the listening public to keep in mind is that in Vietnam, there are just no easy answers.

The Record Is Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, before resuming air strikes over North Vietnam, this country tried every conceivable way to get Hanoi to the conference table.

We went the second mile, and the third, and the fourth.

The limits to which this country did go in its search for peace is best summed up in an editorial I read in the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle.

"The Story of 37 Days," the editorial states, is the story of how we suspended bombing in North Vietnam to prove our devotion to peace; of how we sent 6 of our best diplomats to 32 capitals of the world, of how we contacted 115 governments in all, plus various organizations and the Vatican in a search for peace.

This editorial says:

It is the story of how we kept a check with scores of governments and groupings of governments to see if Hanoi had made even the tiniest of responses. It had not. Only insults.

According to the Gannett newspapers:

The story of 37 days has not been in vain. We have gained allies, we have made our cause clear, we have proved that peace cannot be unilateral.

lation of policy for bilateral negotiations, and to insure that such policies are promptly passed down—and implemented.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 7, the New York Post started a series of articles entitled "Vietnam: The Endless War" by correspondent Pete Hamill, who writes with great insight about this cruel conflict. I urge my colleagues to read this article as well as the rest of the series which I will insert in the Appendix of the RECORD as they appear.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Feb. 7, 1966]

Vietnam: THE ENDLESS WAR (By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—There are, of course, no good wars. But today, in a small country on the far side of the world, the mightiest military power on earth is engaged in one of the dirtiest, most frustrating, most casually brutal wars of modern times, and can see no immediate prospects for victory. As a nation, we are spending billions of dollars, and permitting the deaths of thousands of young men, but the most optimistic progress reports say only that we are no longer losing the war. We have 200,000 troops scattered across the Republic of South Vietnam and they are still not enough.

They are battling as I write this, those young men, in some of the cruelest terrain soldiers have ever been asked to fight upon. They are fighting in the filth of rice paddies, in the dark crawling recesses of trackless jungle, in the mosquito-ridden Central Highlands, on the spits of barren beaches. They are using the most destructive weapons in man's history, short of nuclear arms, yet each day the enemy grows in strength.

That enemy—whether called the Vietcong or the National Liberation Front—is one which specializes in assassination, terror, and refined cruelty. The countryside of South Vietnam has been fertilized for 8 years now with the bodies of murdered hamlet chieftains, schoolteachers, priests and anonymous citizens. Every day of every week, the Vietcong destroy bridges, schoolhouses and the homes of people who have committed the sin of disagreeing with them. For the Vietcong, the most potent political weapon is terror. A village which has seen its chieftain ripped from neck to navel, his children smashed against a wall and his wife bleeding to death with her breasts cut off will not oppose these people the next time around. They are doing all of this, they claim for the greater good and future happiness of Vietnam. If one needed at this date a case study in the ruthlessness of the committed Communist revolutionary, the Vietcong would certainly provide it.

Each day, these young Americans are a fraction more brutalized by this war, just a bit more cynical. In Da Nang several weeks ago, I asked a marine sergeant whether he had any solution for the problem of South Vietnam. "Yeah," he said. "Pave it."

This country we are spending our national treasure on, and allowing our young men to die for, has been in existence only 12 years. It was carved out of the remnants of French

Indochina, along with Laos, Cambodia, and North Vietnam. It runs about 450 miles from the southern tip of the Mekong Delta to the 17th parallel above Hue, which slices it away from North Vietnam. The majority of the 15 million people live in the delta and on the coastal plains which run off from the long mountain range that traverses the republic from north to south.

Americans have been involved in the fighting in South Vietnam since before the fall of the French at Dienbienphu in 1954. Originally, our military men were advisers in the true sense of the word: we helped train the South Vietnamese Army, which was then fighting with the French against the Vietminh. By the time the Geneva Agreements were signed in 1954, we had some 600 military men and civilians there on official business. The number has grown yearly since then. It happened gradually, so gradually that we did not really seem to see it happening at all. Today, whether we like it or not we are engaged in a growing undeclared land war in Asia.

Most people I talked to in this country are aware of, and disturbed by, the moral dilemmas posed by this war. They see it as the inevitable confrontation with Communist China. Some of them admit that we are acting in our own self-interests and that the interests of the South Vietnamese themselves don't really matter. They know that the war will be a long one. The most conservative estimates I heard have the war lasting at least 10 years, at the cost of billions of dollars and thousands of American lives. "This," said one top political officer in Saigon, "will be the longest war we've ever gotten ourselves into. We could be fighting it still in 1990."

The more one probes into the can of worms in Saigon, the more acute that moral dilemma becomes. The Government of South Vietnam—like its Communist counterpart in the north—has never held a free national election, allows for no dissenting political parties, censors the press. Its ideology is anticommunism. It is led by the latest in a series of military juntas.

The credentials of these men for leading a nation into war seem to be only a desire for power and quick fortunes, and the ability to express a glib anticommunism. The more unstable the Government of South Vietnam becomes, the stronger our commitment. That of Nguyen Cao Ky is no better and no wores than its predecessors.

In Saigon, the small talk says Ky himself will soon be out. President Johnson's trip to Honolulu looks like a desperate measure to prop up the government. It doesn't seem to matter; our policy is like betting more and more money on a horse which falls farther and farther behind. On the Vietnamese lunar calendar, this is the year of the horse, but no one with sense is betting on it.

It would be a mistake to believe that the Vietcong are a band of hardy, noble Robin Hoods marching out of Sherwood Forest to do battle with the wicked Sheriff of Nottingham and his American allies in Saigon. But unfortunately they have recognized that South Vietnam is a country ripe for revolution. They know that the social structure of the country is a tangle of feudalism and corruption and their popular support rests on that and a crude form of nationalism.

"I would hate to be the man in the White House, given the true facts in South Vietnam," said one civilian political officer, who has worked in the country for several years. "It is one thing to send money to a country, if that country is prepared to fight for its life. But when we decided to send in a large army last year we admitted that Government could not fight its own battles. So we have young Americans here now, dying in larger and larger numbers, for a Government which does not really care."

These young Americans are dying, among

other reasons, to allow the merchants of Saigon a continuing free lunch at the trough of American wealth.

While supplies for our soldiers are backed up in the Saigon River, and loaded ships are forced to wait at enormous expense in harbors as far away as Manila, the merchants of Saigon refuse to move goods from their jammed warehouses until the prices are driven up or the rental becomes sufficiently huge.

They, at least, never had it so good. They are dying to make sure that no rice paddy farmer's son will ever have the effrontery to ask for a university education. They are dying to make sure that one of the most incompetent groups of civil servants anywhere can continue its long, slow suck of the country's marrow.

They are dying so that the daughters of the members of the Cercle Sportif can vacation at Cannes in the summertime, while the children in the countryside die in stunned silence, their stomachs distended by disease.

The young men are dying, some military strategists have told us, because if South Vietnam falls to the Communists, the other nations of southeast Asia will follow, like so many dominoes. Cambodia, Laos, Thailand will go, followed by Malaya, the Philippines, Indonesia, even—I do not exaggerate—Australia. Eventually, this theory goes, we will be fighting the Chinese Communists in Hawaii or San Diego. This might be true, and certainly the United States, as a world power, must make clear to China that it will not fold up before the rhetoric of violence. But while we are pouring arms, money, and men into the war in South Vietnam, the other pieces in the domino theory are falling anyway.

The guerrilla war has been fought in South Vietnam since 1958. But Cambodia is already a dead loss, in the hands of one of the prime sovereign clowns in the Orient; Laos is split between a soft neutral government and the Pathet Lao Communists along the Vietnamese border, and guerrillas are already prowling the countryside of Thailand. Obviously, something is going wrong.

Something is wrong when the Vietcong, who had about 5,000 men in 1960, can expand to an estimated 150,000 after 6 years of defoliation, bombing, napalm, helicopters, and all the rest of our modern arsenal.

Something is wrong when some of our Congressmen make brave speeches about bombing Hanoi and Haiphong, while the Vietcong already have in their control 75 percent of the territory and 50 percent of the population of the South.

"It's too late in the game to think we can solve this problem by bombing the North," one American political officer told me here several weeks ago (before the resumption of bombing). "Sure, their weapons are coming from the North, and we should continue to bomb the Ho Chi Minh Trail. But hell, our Vietnamese are getting their weapons from us. Under those terms the North Vietnamese Government should have the right to bomb Seattle.

"The fight for South Vietnam is right here, in the countryside, and you don't solve that problem by blasting Hanoi off the map."

We have been told for years now that we are involved in South Vietnam for simple reasons. At the request of the legitimate government, we have been asked to help defend that republic against armed aggression from North Vietnam. But in the opinion of most observers, there never has been a legitimate government of South Vietnam.

Even more debatable is the extent of actual aggression being committed by the North against the South. It is certain that North Vietnamese regulars took part in last November's fierce fighting at Pleime and the Ia Drang Valley. And in the recent battle for Bong Son I personally saw dead men in

What I hope the 1960's will be remembered for are the steps we have taken in education and health and in the understanding of our fellowman, not just in the 50 States of this Union, but in all the continents of the world.

It may just be a few thousand or a few million that starts the program. The poverty program was really started with the NYA and the CCC back in the 1930's, and it has developed from there. The whole great conservation movement in our water resources in this country started with something we probably called TVA that Senator Norris did.

The health program that this man picked up when he was a lone wolf—when he got lonely he went to see Mr. HILL in the Senate, but outside of the two of them there weren't many around that could believe you could do something about it. Yet there are people in this room today that are living testimonials to the fruits of his research.

It gives me such a great satisfaction to attempt in the best way I can to pay tribute to Congressman FOGARTY from the great State of Rhode Island.

Elkhart, Ind., Truth Praises the Work of the Inter-American Development Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the January 27, 1966, Elkhart, Ind., Truth praising the outstanding record of the Inter-American Development Bank in the advancement of hemisphere development and good relations.

The editorial follows:

DEVELOPMENT BANK HELPS LATINIS

The Inter-American Development Bank has an outstanding record in the advancement of hemisphere development and good relations.

"One part of the alliance for progress that no one complains about," Time magazine has called it.

The IADB enjoyed a record year for lending in 1965. The Bank granted 66 loans last year for a total of \$373,500,000—an average of roughly \$1.75 for every human being in Latin America.

The old record for loans in 1 year was \$325,500,000 in 1962. Since making its first loan in February 1961, the Bank has made \$1.5 billion available to its clients.

Under the shrewd direction of Felipe Herrera, a Chilean, the Bank is in good condition as it begins its sixth year.

It has resources of more than \$3 billion and a sound international reputation.

For many Latin Americans, the IADB was the first solid sign that the United States really cared about Latin America. The Bank represented the first major move after World War II to give special U.S. attention to Latin America.

Latinos for years had wanted their own bank, arguing that the existing World Bank and Export-Import Bank failed to fill their special needs. The Bank's legal existence dates from December 30, 1959, and it formally began operations on October 1, 1960, a month before John F. Kennedy was elected President.

The United States is the principal patron of the Bank—this country has put up more than half the money for it so far, but the Latin Americans themselves have contributed more than \$200 million. Mexico and Venezuela have put in more than \$100 million apiece. Each of the 19 Latin American members (Cuba is not one of them) has anted up at least \$9 million for the Bank to use in lending.

The U.S. voice in the operation is substantial and continuing.

But it neither has nor wants absolute control. Besides, there is Herrera: "Felipe is a strong man," says an American who knows him well. "He would never consent to sit anywhere that he was just a rubber stamp."

For 1965, the direction of the Bank's loans followed a typical pattern: \$90 million for projects in Brazil, \$60 million to Mexico, and \$50 million to Argentina. More than 40 percent of the money loaned by the Bank since 1961 has gone into these three countries.

Nevertheless, every member has been helped a little.

So far, says the Bank, not one of the countries has failed to make its loan repayments on time. For the United States, that's an almost-unprecedented success story in an area where things often go wrong.

Rehabilitation of Wounded Vietnamese Soldiers

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, the Honorable Ted C. Connell, former national commander in chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars, recently visited Vietnam and saw firsthand the medical facilities for wounded Vietnamese soldiers. He has also visited the group of 56 paraplegic Vietnamese patients who are presently undergoing treatment in the Veterans' Administration hospital at Castle Point, N.Y. Mr. Connell has made several recommendations which deserve consideration. Our gallant Vietnamese allies deserve all of the medical help we can give them, and they deserve the expressions of friendship which would be demonstrated by carrying out Mr. Connell's recommendations.

I am inserting below the letter from Mr. Connell regarding this:

KILLEEN, TEX.,
February 1, 1966.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Sixth Congressional District of Texas,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: As an average American citizen, I visited and talked with the 56 paraplegic Vietnamese patients and of 14-member staff of trainees who accompanied them to America.

Words will not convey the good this humanitarian act by our President has done, not only for the patients, but the doctors and staff, who after training, will return to their homeland to better serve the unfortunate in South Vietnam. You have made 70 good will ambassadors for America, for as long as they live, they will continue to tell all of the world they come in contact with, of not only the excellent care they received while here,

but also of the warm heartfelt attitude of thousands of Americans who wrote them letters, sent Christmas cards, and came to visit. Prominently displayed in each patient's room is a Christmas card from the President of the United States of America.

Mr. Vincent W. Powers, hospital director, and his staff are doing an excellent job. They have nothing but praise and admiration for the assistance and moral support given them by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, director, Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation of New York University Medical Center. His valuable counselling, moral support, and untiring efforts has endeared this dedicated American to all who work with him.

I was told that the majority of the patients would be ready to return to their country in 3 to 6 months. That the doctors and nurses would be ready to return to set up a paraplegic center in South Vietnam in 9 months, a program sorely needed in that war-torn country.

I would like to respectfully recommend the following:

1. That the program be expanded to include other paraplegics and amputees in South Vietnam, as no other organization in the world has the experience in this field as our Veterans' Administration.

2. That we continue to bring a team with each contingency of patients, remembering that in a country of over 16 million people, they have less than 800 doctors, 500 who are in the army; only 28 hospitals with surgical facilities, while in 1964 the civilian population had over 11,000 casualties.

3. That out of the 20 Vietnamese nurses in our country on scholarships from USAID, several are graduating in January 1966. At least 3 or 4 should be assigned immediately to Castle Point for a period of at least 3 months to work with the 56 patients there. (Elizabeth Darden at USAID in Washington heads this program.)

4. That before the medical team leaves our country, the team be afforded an opportunity to tour Veterans' Administration rehabilitation centers in America.

Respectfully yours,

TED C. CONNELL.

The Cost of Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been written on the cost and mismanagement of the war on poverty program, yet specific items must be isolated and emphasized for us to get the proper picture.

The Hegewisch News, an independent publication serving the southeastern section of Chicago, carried a very timely and practical editorial in its issue of February 4:

THE COST OF WELFARE

"Even in the Great Society, it would be cheaper to send the unemployed to Harvard."

That wry editorial comment comes from the Charleston, S. C., News & Courier. It has to do with some revealing facts concerning training projects in Virginia, as disclosed by Senator ROBERTSON of that State. Examples: 36 unemployed kitchen helpers were being trained at a cost of \$83,601. Sixty unemployed persons were being trained as nurses' aids at a cost of \$78,390. Eighteen

February 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A615

HINDLEY, of Illinois; Representative LYNN E. STALBAUM, of Wisconsin; and myself.

Senator MCGOVERN's remarks were brief and to the point and I asked unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN AT THE ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS

I want to congratulate the Committee on the World Food Crisis for its leadership in planning this meeting.

We are here to concentrate new attention on the most important problem in the world—the present fact of human hunger and the mounting race between food and people. Malnutrition is public enemy No. 1. It lies close to the base of man's most fundamental concerns. It is a breeder of disease, premature death, economic stagnation, and political disorder. It is the most acute challenge to the agricultural technology, the political imagination, and the moral conscience of mankind.

I have just returned from a tour of Vietnam followed by an address to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Conference in Rome. The comparison between the tragic destruction in Vietnam and the quiet but effective crusade against hunger discussed at the Rome Conference was a painful contrast indeed.

No nation has ever sent abroad a more gallant and superbly trained group of men than our fighting team now doing battle in Vietnam. But the grim fact is that a growing number of them will face death unless the diplomats can find a breakthrough to the conference table. That is the only course that makes any sense in this bleeding land that is afflicted with so many problems that do not respond to a military effort. One wonders even if military victory should come after years of slaughter and devastation, if there could then be built on such a chaotic foundation a political structure capable of resisting the appeals of Communist cadres. It saddens one's heart to see the lives of so many brave men committed to a cause with such an uncertain political base. In the hospitals near Saigon, in the refugee camps along the coast, and with the marines in the field near Da Nang and Chulai, I found myself recalling the doubtless oversimplified words of Benjamin Franklin: "There never was a good war nor a bad peace."

But however bad war may be and however uncertain its outcome, there is one war that is a good war and that can end in victory for all mankind. That is the war against hunger—the most important war man must fight for the rest of the century. And this is the war to which this Conference is committed.

There is no doubt in my mind that we can win the race against population and famine in the years ahead. We have the tools and the knowledge to drive hunger from the earth within the next decade. We can end this century with a better fed world than we have today in spite of population growth, if we conduct the war against hunger with a fraction of the zeal and resources we now bring to military conflict. Victory over the dread killer, hunger, will require bold and imaginative commanders; it calls for the proper deployment of troops and the wise use of ammunition and logistical support; it calls for enlistment for the duration by both the developed and the less developed people of the globe.

This conference represents an important part of that commitment. We are led by Chairman James Patton, an internationally known statesman of agriculture. We are led, too, by the executive director of the organizing committee, Robert Koch, one of

the most brilliant men in the field of food and agriculture today. And we are led by a distinguished committee of such respected names as Hershel Newsom, Dwayne Andreas, Pat Greathouse, Robert Liebenow, and Maurice Atkins.

These are men who have spoken clearly for a quarter of a century and more on the challenges and opportunities in the field of agriculture. It must be a source of satisfaction to them and to others that public opinion is now responding to their message.

The organizing group has given us a great American as our speaker for today's luncheon. He is one of the men whom I most admire in the entire world. If there is such a creature as the ugly American, there is also the beautiful American. And no one represents the best of America any more clearly than our distinguished speaker today—a brilliant industrialist, an accomplished public official, and international statesman, and, beginning January 1 of next year, the head of the new United Nations Development Program—Mr. Paul Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman, we are glad you are here, and we look forward to what you have to say.

Heart of the Year Award Goes to Hon. John E. Fogarty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, has handled some of the most important health legislation ever enacted by the Congress. There is no doubt that these measures, such as the Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the heart disease, cancer, and stroke amendments, the Medical Library Assistance Act, and the Nurses Training Act will help us to conquer many dreadful diseases which now take a heavy toll of lives each year.

However, we are all very much aware that it would serve no purpose to enact the authorizing legislation if we did not also provide the funds to carry out these programs. The champion in this field for many years has been our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations he has handled legislation to insure that these programs are funded in the best interest of the American people. We have all heard him speak eloquently of the need for adequate funds to insure the success of programs to wipe out disease and mental illness. Because of his outstanding work in this field, I was very pleased to note that he has been selected by the American Heart Association to receive the Heart of the Year Award. There is no doubt that he is truly a man with a big heart for all who suffer from illness and disease.

President Johnson paid a great tribute to JOHN FOGARTY last week when he presented him with this award and I insert

the President's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON PRESENTATION OF HEART OF THE YEAR AWARD OF THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY IN THE THEATER

Congressman FOGARTY, Dr. Taussig, ladies and gentlemen, when we read that a fully functioning heart is possible within 5 years, we pay tribute to congressional leadership, and particularly to Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

When we finally call a halt to the wholesale murder of heart disease, all of us will bless the day that Congress took effective action. JOHN FOGARTY represents the little State of Rhode Island in the U.S. Congress, but his crusade for better health has led him often to the first house of the land.

He came here last August 4 for the signing of the Community Facilities Act. He was back again the next day at the signing of the Community Health Services Extension Act, Community Mental Health Centers one week; Community Health Service Extension Act the next week.

Four days later he came back to see us as a sponsor of the National Institutes of Health for the signing of the Health Research Facilities Act. In October he was back at the White House again for the signing of the heart, cancer and stroke amendments, to establish regional medical centers to help us in fighting these killer diseases.

Now he is back with us again this morning. He doesn't have a bill in his pocket, a congressional bill, I mean, but this, I think I can tell you: When he comes to this House, he is always welcome.

For JOHN FOGARTY knows what we all must learn, and that is that no society can be great which is not first of all healthy. The healing miracles that we achieve must not be gifts for Americans only, and that is why we have suggested another health measure for this Nation to discuss, debate, consider, and, I hope, ultimately act upon. That is the International Health Act of 1966.

That is to launch a cooperative effort by all of the world's people to make a determined and organized attempt to conquer disease wherever it exists in human beings. I don't let you in on any secret when I say I am hopeful that after this International Health Act of 1966 is considered in the House and Senate that it will not be long before JOHN FOGARTY is back here, and Dr. Taussig, paying us another visit, and waiting for his pen.

The world cannot wait. The clock is ticking.

I know that as we work on these messages, outline our hopes and our purposes, our ambitions in the world, that some people may think that we have too many goodies, that we are pretty visionary, and that we have something for everyone.

The cynical sometimes are critical. But I know of no more worthy motive or purpose that a human being can have than to try to lay out as his or her goal a program that will educate the mind and that will conquer disease in the body and that will permit your children and your people to live in an atmosphere and an environment of beauty and culture and enjoy the better things of life.

Now, we cannot conquer disease and we cannot educate all humanity and we cannot have a symphony in every town, and we cannot have a Mellon Art Gallery in every capital, but we can hope for them and we can work for them and we can give what we have to them, and we can urge them and provide leadership and ideas and try to move along.

I was reading a speech late last night that the Postmaster General under President Roosevelt made, and he talked about his first 100 days and his first 100 bills, and how most of them lived on today and none of them had ever been really repealed.

A644

ranked this section), and least important as a basis for opposition is the belief that "U.S. national security is not involved." Yet many stressed the danger of escalation to all-out war" (cited first by 21 percent) and the feeling that "The South Vietnamese people do not want us there (19 percent). And although the belief that the "United States has not kept its commitment to seek peace at any time in any place" received fewer first rankings than any of the other listed reasons, this response nonetheless ranked nearly evenly in all categories.

Of particular significance is the extent to which people qualify their support or opposition. Although those who oppose U.S. policy in Vietnam are, proportionately, more inclined to qualify their general feelings than are those who support the war effort, fully 10 percent of the supporters indicated a fear of escalation—though only 2 to 4 percent cited each of the other three reasons for opposition. On the other hand, those who oppose U.S. policy qualified their opposition rather evenly among the four reasons offered for supporting the war in Vietnam; each reason was cited by 6 to 8 percent of the opponents.

Yet opponents of the war in Vietnam need not be overly disheartened by the overwhelming (63 percent) support given U.S. policy. For while present policy aims at Vietcong capitulation, only 27 percent of those polled favor such capitulation as a basis for negotiations. (Could it be that some of the supporters don't understand U.S. policy?) A resounding 63 percent call for "U.N. mediation" and 9 percent desire "Unilateral U.S. declaration of a cease-fire." Furthermore, the majority (62 percent) of those polled believe that in negotiations the U.S. should "Agree to any settlement acceptable to a majority of the South Vietnamese people," while only 38 percent call for "a settlement that would guarantee a non-Communist government for South Vietnam."

Finally, when asked what they would do if drafted, only 48 percent of the Stanford men would "be willing to serve in Vietnam," while 41 percent would try "to be assigned elsewhere, but accept unwillingly service in Vietnam"; 11 percent declare that they would "Refuse to serve in Vietnam." Or, as one girl on the row wrote in the margin: "If drafted, I would burn my draft officer."

At an average of \$1.10 a bushel, the value of the 1965 Illinois corn crop was just above \$1 billion. This amount does not include Government payments received by farmers under the feed grain program. These payments were near, or above, \$100 million.

The State average corn yield was 92 bushels per acre, which was 14 bushels higher than in 1964 and 7 bushels above the previous record set in 1963. Illinois had the second highest yield in the Corn Belt. Indiana was first with 94 bushels. Yields in other States were: Iowa, 82; Wisconsin, 76; Ohio, 75; Missouri, 72; Nebraska, 67; Michigan, 62, and Minnesota, 61. Some of these States may have higher yields in 1966, but yields in Indiana and Illinois are not likely to equal those of the past year.

BIGGEST SOYBEAN CROP

Illinois farmers produced 175 million bushels of soybeans in 1965. This amount was 22 percent more than in the previous year and 6 percent more than the previous record crop produced 2 years before.

The big crop was the result of a large acreage and high yields. The USDA estimated the harvested acreage to be 6,021,000, which was 5 percent more than in 1964 and 8 percent more than in 1963. The State average yield was 29 bushels per acre, 4 bushels more than in 1964 but one-half bushel less than the record yield of 1963. Soybean production in 1966 could equal or exceed 1965 levels.

Soybean prices are receiving support from high prosperity in the industrialized nations, food shortages in the underdeveloped countries, and threats of international conflict.

Cattle feeders made unusually good profits in 1965. Prices of Choice steers at Chicago averaged about \$26 a hundred pounds, the best in 3 years. Since these cattle had been bought at unusually low prices, the profit margins were very good. Cattle now in feedlots have cost much more than those sold in 1965. Consequently, profits may be lower even if prices of fat cattle exceed those of last year.

BEST HOG PROFITS IN A LIFETIME

Hog prices advanced spectacularly in 1965. The average price of barrows and gilts at Chicago rose from \$14.43 in November 1964 to over \$28 this past December. Hog prices seem likely to hold up well in 1966, especially during the first half of the year. We are now in what may prove to be the most profitable period in a lifetime for hog producers.

Vietnam policy poll

	Number	Percent			
		For	Against	Neither	No opinion
Overall total.....	1,512	63	27	10	2
Undergraduates.....	1,361	66	23	10	2
Men.....	979	68	21	9	1
Women.....	424	60	26	11	3
Graduates.....	105	39	49	11	1
Faculty.....	22	14	82	4	1
Political leanings:					
Republicans.....	612	82	8	8	2
Democrats.....	494	46	44	9	1
Neither.....	372	53	31	13	2
Residence:					
Wilbur.....	297	70	19	10	2
Stern.....	185	66	25	9	1
Fraternity.....	347	73	18	9	1
Clubs.....	129	57	31	10	2
Union.....	11	9	91	1	1
Bran/Roble.....	146	63	24	10	3
Lagunita.....	59	68	17	14	2
Flo Mo.....	111	56	31	12	3
Row.....	76	62	21	12	5
Br/Ro-Wilb.....	443	67	20	10	3
Class:					
Freshmen.....	466	70	18	9	2
Sophomores.....	307	69	23	7	1
Juniors.....	295	63	23	12	2
Seniors.....	304	57	32	10	1
Field of study:					
Social sciences.....	501	62	28	9	1
Humanities.....	313	50	38	10	3
Engineering.....	147	80	9	11	1
Math/science.....	295	67	21	11	1
Undeclared.....	228	65	22	10	3

Illinois—First in Soybean and Corn Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Stark County News on January 26, 1966, has reported that Illinois has become the first to produce a billion-dollar crop of any kind. Illinois corn production totaled about 912 million bushels; this is a 25-percent increase over 1964.

The State also had an increase of 22 percent in its soybean production, a total of 175 million bushels of soybeans.

The article follows:

ILLINOIS BECOMES FIRST STATE TO PRODUCE A BILLION-DOLLAR CROP

Will this year match 1965 as a good year for midwestern farmers? Maybe. But last year was an exceptional one in the Midwest, especially in Illinois. Our crops, particularly corn, were very good. And profits from livestock production were unusually high.

Corn is by far the most important element in Illinois agriculture. About half of the State farm income originates in our cornfields. In 1965 Illinois farmers produced a corn crop worth a billion dollars, making Illinois the first State to produce a billion-dollar crop of any kind.

The final 1965 official estimate of the Illinois corn crop was 892 million bushels of grain. This amount was 25 percent more than the 1964 crop and 19 percent more than the previous record output in 1963. It was enough to put Illinois in first place among the States in corn production. Corn made into silage included an additional 20 million bushels. Corn production in 1965, therefore, totaled about 912 million bushels.

Imaginative Measures Needed To Win War Against Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, the organizational meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis was held in Washington recently.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, former director of the food for peace program, was one of the speakers at a congressional panel discussion on ways and means to wage an all-out effort to end hunger, malnutrition, and want in the world. Other panelists included Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina; Representative PAUL

February 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A613

ARRIVAL STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR EDWARD A. CLARK ON RETURN TO AUSTRALIA FROM THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 23, 1966

Friends and allies, I bring you greetings from the President and the people of the United States. I have just returned to Australia from a 3-week visit there. I visited the President both at his ranch in Texas and at the White House in Washington. He remembers with great happiness his wartime service here and always says that the only person he'd trade jobs with is me. Next to being President of the United States, he'd rather be Ambassador to Australia than any other job in the world.

I visited our four banks in Austin, Center, San Augustine, and San Benito; my law office in Austin, Tex.; my own lands in the piney woods of east Texas; and my grandchildren in the State of Mississippi on the banks of that great inland waterway, the Mississippi River. I visited the office of the State Department (External Affairs to you) in Washington, our National Capital. I visited the big cities of Texas, Dallas and Houston. I talked to bankers, oilmen, big ranchers, and little bee farmers—a cross section of America. The words of Sir Walter Scott echoed in my heart. "This is my own, my native land," but oddly there was another echo in my heart, another dream intruding in my slumbers of the broad and beautiful land which is now my second homeland. My friends, I am happy to be home again with you.

Beyond your imagination is the interest and affectionate feeling I found in the States for Australia. Such words as, "Those folks think just like us." I met a man traveling around the world from Australia. He told me that next to Australia, he'd like to live in west Texas. A great musician asked two questions: "What time is it in Australia?" and "How can I buy some land—I'd like to own a small piece of that continent." A former soldier proudly introducing his beautiful wife says: "Australia gave me my greatest asset. I love that country." If the distance were not so great, I'll warrant the exchange of visitors would be so great we'd have to expand our hotel facilities to take care of them in the United States and in Australia. As Sir Stanley Burbury in Hobart said after his trip around the world, "Time and distance are nothing; only money." We are going to have to find a way to reduce that cost with group flights or some other imaginative scheme so that there can be more exchange between our two friendly peoples.

Then there was the big question asked from top to bottom: from the President to the most callow schoolboy, "Do the Australians support us in Vietnam?" I was able to look them all dead in the eye and proudly proclaim, "They do." Australians know where their interests lie, and they carry their share of the load. Diggers voluntarily, willingly, have shouldered their Mathildas again, and, just as they did at Gallipoli, at El Alamein, in New Guinea, they are marching beside American doughboys, pulling their share with equal efficiency and cheerfulness, because they know the United States and Australia are defending the same frontier; that frontier is not the Rhine, but Vietnam.

Letter From a Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. RUSSELL TUTEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a friend and pa-

triot that expressed the sentiments of my people of the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia concerning the war in Vietnam. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the Record:

FIRST FEDERAL SAVINGS
& LOAN ASSOCIATION,

St. Simons Island, Ga., January 25, 1966.

Hon. J. RUSSELL TUTEN,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: I note from the latest editorial of U.S. World News the Senators and Congressmen feel the war in Vietnam should be brought to a conclusion as early as possible and the military should be given the opportunity to win the war and not seek a stalemate as was done in Korea. I also note they do not feel the use of ground forces and putting our boys through the "meat grinder" by degrees is not the way to fight this war as this kind of war is the kind the Vietcong would like to fight. It is further noted the House and Senate both feel we should bomb the sources of supplies and military and power installations in North Vietnam in order to bring the war to a rapid conclusion.

The consensus of opinion seems to be this could be done without involving Red China or Soviet Russia in a third world war. Of course, I know the administration has a lot of facts we do not have but I do not think there should be any group called "hawks and doves." I am sure "the hawks" do not want to escalate the war but they do want to fight the war to win and not, as stated, continue to use up our boys fighting the war the Vietcong would like to have us fight it.

I have a married son 23 years of age who is a graduate of the University of Georgia, who has volunteered and has been accepted in the Officers Training School for Army Service. I am myself a war veteran and our family has not hesitated to serve their country and I would like to reiterate we feel they should not have to fight with their hands tied behind their backs but should be allowed to win victory for their country when our young men are giving their lives for it.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Secretary Dean Rusk and to President Johnson, but I doubt seriously if anyone in the administration will ever see it.

With warm personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN A. WAY.

UN
Stanford Backs Our Policy in VietnamEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a poll conducted at Stanford University in which 63 percent of those polled expressed support of America's policy in Vietnam. As much as 12 percent failed to express an opinion one way or the other, actual support for our policy was 71 percent.

Steve Heglund, who formerly served the minority as a House page, recently wrote an interesting article for the Stanford Daily, in which he analyzed the results of the poll. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including his article and the breakdown of the poll:

POLL SHOWS 63 PERCENT OF COMMUNITY
BACKS AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM

(By Steve Heglund)

Are you a Republican? An engineering major? If so, the odds are 4 to 1 that you support the present U.S. policy in Vietnam. But if you are a Democrat, or if your field is humanities, it's an even bet. These are but a few of the intriguing patterns which emerge from tabulations of the Stanford Vietnam poll taken last November 29 and 30, which indicates that a large majority of the Stanford community, 63 percent favors the war effort, while 26 percent opposes it.

The poll, sponsored by the Political Union and distributed in residences and in departmental offices, was designed not only to estimate the extent of support and opposition to United States-Vietnam policy, but also to determine, if possible, what basic beliefs account for this support and opposition. In addition, the poll sought to indicate feelings about the conditions for and the goals of negotiations to end the war. The tabulations provide a backdrop for the winter quarter FOCUS program of the Political Union, entitled "U.S. Policy in Southeast Asia," and consisting of 5 weeks of coordinated lectures and discussions of the various issues involved. A similar poll will be conducted at the end of the quarter, in order to trace changes in Vietnam sentiment.

MORE POLLS LATER

Computer correlation of general feelings about United States-Vietnam policy with class, residence, political leanings, and field of study (see table below) revealed the following:

1. A marked drop in support for U.S. policy, from the freshman to the graduate level. (Note: Difficulties in distribution and collection of polls made it impossible to obtain a sampling of graduate students and faculty either sizable or representative enough to warrant generalizations.)
2. Greater opposition, proportionately, among undergraduate women than among undergraduate men. (Note: Women are underrepresented in the poll; the percentages polled at Union (16 percent) and Lagunita (20 percent) fall considerably below the overall number of undergraduates polled (33 percent), while those at Wilbur (42 percent) and at the Eating Clubs (39 percent) are above the total percentage.)
3. A decided split among Democrats, a bare plurality favoring present U.S. policy.
4. Considerable opposition among freshmen sponsors to the war in Vietnam. (Note: Compare the freshmen totals with the Braner/Roble-Wilbur totals in the table below.)
5. Much greater opposition among those in the field of humanities than among those in other fields. (Note: This may, however, reflect a disproportionately large number of graduate students in this field who were polled.)
6. A significant number (8-12 percent in nearly all groupings) who are neither for nor against the present war effort.

ANTICOMMUNISM

The poll listed four possible reasons for support of U.S. policy in Vietnam and asked that they be ranked in order of their importance to each individual. By far the most important (cited first by 59 percent of those who ranked this section) is: "It is essential to the containment of communism for U.S. national security." The other three, in decreasing order of their importance, are: (2) "It promotes the freedom and independence of the South Vietnamese people"; (3) "It is necessary for us to keep prior commitments"; (4) "As a U.S. citizen, I feel it is my duty to support U.S. foreign policy."

No such clear-cut ranking emerges among those who oppose U.S. policy. "It violates my moral principles" stands out as the most important reason (cited first by 25 percent who

transportation and lower prices to the consumer, water resource development, water supply, power, recreation and conservation.

So I join you in opposing special charges and user taxes on America's historically free waterways. Such taxes would retard essential development, upset competitive balance, bring economic hardship to businesses which depend on water commerce (and many do), raise prices of transporting goods and materials, and it would be an economic hardship to inland cities like Louisville and Jeffersonville.

JEFFBOAT

And the milestone reached today of producing the first seagoing vessel by Jeffboat since World War II symbolizes the contribution of Jeffboat and its parent company, American Commercial Lines, Inc.

Jeffboat is a producer. In 1965 it completes its greatest peacetime operation in its history—with 233 barges, 2 towboats, 1 deepwater vessel. In 1966 things look even better—250 barges, 7 towboats, and another deepwater vessel. A barge a day.

Jeffboat is a wealth creator. In 1965 its revenue will exceed \$20 million and in 1966 this figure is expected to exceed \$25 million. It is now the Nation's biggest manufacturer, tonnage-wise, of barges, towboats, and related marine equipment. And it meets a staggering production schedule.

Jeffboat is an employer, too—920 people approximately were employed in 1965 and this figure will probably exceed 1,000 next year. Its present annual payroll is approximately \$6.3 million.

And, of course, it's a consumer, too, using, for instance, about 9,000 tons of steel a month.

Jeffboat and the American Commercial Lines have had a distinguished history reaching back into World War II when it produced 125 LST's. It was honored five times by the U.S. Navy. The best is ahead.

So I am exceedingly pleased to be here because this is a happy occasion. All of us want to build and grow and create. And you have done this in a remarkable way. You are helping the Ohio River Valley and southern Indiana and the Louisville metropolitan area take a giant stride forward in meeting the needs of its citizens. You are conserving, improving, and making use of our natural environment—the waterways—to the benefit of all of us. And many of us here today draw strength and encouragement from what you do—do for yourselves and for the Ohio River Valley and for the Nation.

I look forward to a great future for the Ohio River Valley—a future in which we will match our performance with our potential, our wealth with our resources, our power with our purpose.

I look forward to an Ohio River Valley—
Developing its natural environment.
Harvesting its rich crops.
Achieving in the arts and sciences.
Using its waterways to make the economy vital and vibrant.

And I salute you in the major part you are playing to bring the Ohio River Valley to its finest hour.

Necessary Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have taken the floor to support President Johnson on his decisions in Vietnam. The record continues

to mount on how right the President is.

We Americans love peace and want peace, but by now it should be clear to all of us and, indeed to all the world, that the long pause in bombing raids did not persuade Ho Chi Minh to make even the slightest gesture toward peace.

On the contrary, Hanoi only reiterated its demand that the United States surrender its commitment and withdraw from Vietnam. This, the administration will not do.

Meanwhile, the search for peace will be continued—and the bombing has been resumed.

In an editorial entitled "United States Still Seeks Peace," the Detroit News stated that—

This Nation put a stopper on its bombing power for 37 days in its pursuit of a Vietnam peace, but because the Communists did not take even one short step to meet our appeal, North Vietnam is no longer an immune sanctuary.

It adds:

This Nation could no longer leave as a hostage to ill fortune the security of 200,000 American fighting men or the security of allied Vietnamese forces or even the security of the villagers whose freedom we help defend.

As Mr. Johnson stated:

It is our clear duty to do what we can to limit the cost in lives.

The newspaper says:

We will keep knocking on all doors which might lead to peace.

Adding that—

What we could not afford was to prolong the pause and thus risk having the Communist aggressors think our heart wasn't in the job of defending the south's freedom and also risk lives on our side by pinning one hand behind our back.

Because I was so impressed with the good common sense I found in this editorial I would like to recommend it for the perusal of my colleagues, and with their permission it will be inserted in the RECORD:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Feb. 1, 1966]

SECURITY REQUIRED NEW BOMBING, BUT UNITED STATES STILL SEEKS PEACE

This Nation put a stopper on its bombing power for 37 days in its pursuit of a Vietnam peace, but because the Communists did not take even one short step to meet our appeal, North Vietnam is no longer an immune sanctuary.

This Nation could no longer leave as a hostage to ill fortune the security of 200,000 American fighting men or the security of allied Vietnamese forces or even the security of the villagers whose freedom we help defend.

As President Johnson told the Nation and the world, those are the reasons the bomb pause is over. It won not a response but denunciation and rejection. To persist in a diplomatic effort while continuing to expose our military flanks was impossible. "It is our clear duty to do what we can to limit the cost in lives," is the sober way Mr. Johnson put it.

However agonizing the ultimate decision, the alternative to persisting in the lull was an simple as that. The carrot was ignored. The stick is brought back into play. But the carrot is not withdrawn. That is why this Nation has brought the issue of more war or of peace to the U.N. Security Council, so often a meaningful compromiser, but be-

cause of the veto and a lack of military power, rarely a decisionmaker.

The resolution we present here is responsive to "the spirit of the renewed appeal for peace of Pope Paul," Mr. Johnson says. The key word here is "spirit." What the Pope suggested was that neutral nations at the United Nations should arbitrate. The genuine impartiality of some neutral nations is not in doubt. But the motives of others which profess to nonalignment are suspect.

One-third of the U.N. membership is African and professedly nonaligned in the cold war. But as a bloc these nations have pledged themselves over Rhodesia, for example, to a war of "national liberation of the enslaved," much as North Vietnam and Red China are pledged to rid the "enslaved" of South Vietnam from imperialist warmongers.

Nevertheless the decision to bring peace in Vietnam to the attention of the Security Council is welcome, commendable, and even shrewd. It demonstrates that despite the resumed bombing the pursuit of peace is not abandoned.

The world, which witnessed—and in large measure commended—the many-pronged American peace offensive, now sees us on record as calling on the ultimate world peace authority to use its good offices.

Moreover this calls on the Soviet Union (with its veto) to stand up and be counted. It either wants peace in Vietnam or more war. As cochairman of the 1954 Geneva conference, it can no longer fence straddle. Moreover, the recourse to the council demands that De Gaulle (with his veto) act and not preach.

All the doors to peace on which this nation has knocked in the last month are still open—except, it would appear, some Red doors. Now we've flung open a new door. We could do no more. We could do no less. What we could not afford was to prolong the pause and thus risk having the Communist aggressors think our heart wasn't in the job of defending the South's freedom and also risks lives on our side by pinning one hand behind our back.

Ambassador Edward Clark's Statement on His Return to Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago our distinguished Ambassador to Australia, the Honorable Ed Clark and Mrs. Clark, visited Washington in order to talk with the President, the State Department, and other officials. He brought us a message of high patriotism and reminds us again how strong are the ties between America and Australia.

In his brief tenure as Ambassador, Mr. Clark has traveled more miles and visited more cities than most of the other Ambassadors to that country put together. He has brought credit to his country by his open friendliness and colorful character and his genuine interest in the people of Australia.

When he returned to Australia last week he made an arrival statement that I think again shows how deep are his feelings and his affection for the Australian people and that statement is as follows:

February 9, 1966

A641

eral law place a tremendous handicap on a small merchant. We have, for instance, some managers or minor departments that we just can't afford to pay \$150 per week (executive scale). They are part of our management team but we have to make them punch the clock. It takes away their prestige and harms their pride and initiative. It is a sorry situation."

A small merchant lists as his No. 1 problem "Our Federal Government setting minimum pay scales. Very difficult for a small store in a comparatively small town to maintain a \$1.25 minimum pay scale and not reduce the amount of service our customers are used to."

A medium-sized retailer in a city of about 40,000 lists as his third most serious problem the Federal wage-hour regulations (after (1) State and Federal income taxes and (2) State personal property taxes).

"We are greatly concerned over the Federal wage act before Congress as it will be difficult for all small businesses to compete on this hourly basis. It will tend to compel many of the smaller stores to discontinue business and certainly curtail the services now enjoyed by the public.

"I think the big thing that is bothering me Tom, is the proposed minimum wage laws which seem to be gaining momentum. We in the smaller towns are faced with an entirely different picture on minimum wage. Quite frankly we can put up with some inferior help at the rate we are paying, but if they make the move to \$1.25 I have two employees who must go. Nice girls, but they will never command this rate, and when they leave here under a \$1.25 minimum no one else will use them either. Our labor market being as restricted as it is makes it difficult to get the kind of help you need to be able to pay the price the Government thinks they can earn. Let's face it, some people will never be able to be worth certain values such as the minimum wages proposed. In my opinion they will create unemployment.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

"The federalization of unemployment (compensation) is about as needed as another hole in the head. It is a free handout to the loafer and nothing more, again who wants to work for pay when the Government will give a man up to two-thirds of the State average wage."

The leading merchant in a city of about 10,000 says right now his big worries are wage-hour laws and the Federal unemployment compensation bill. "It is really going to hurt our merit rating. We've earned this through many years of careful planning with our employee relations program. Now with one swoop the Federal Government will wipe out this rating (we have earned and deserve because we haven't contributed to any noticeable degree to the unemployment problem.) In fact, we helped the overall employment picture by giving steady employment to around 35 employees year in and year out."

Bringing the Ohio River Valley to Its Finest Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have just had an opportunity to read the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who was

principal speaker at the christening of the first seagoing vessel built on the Ohio River since World War II. His salient observations point up the importance of this great river to the general economy of the entire valley and, indeed, its value to our Nation. Like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], I foresee the Ohio River's vital role in our future progress and economic prosperity.

I commend his remarks to the attention of all the Members and under unanimous consent I insert them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. LEE H. HAMILTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM INDIANA, AT CHRISTENING OF M/V "PHAEDRA," JEFFBOAT, INC., BOAT-YARDS, JEFFERSONVILLE, IND., DECEMBER 18, 1965

You may not be aware of it but today you are witnessing a historic occasion in the life of the Ohio River Valley. You may not be aware of it from my speech because I'm not that good at conveying thoughts, but in spite of my speech, and not because of it, this is a historic occasion.

In Shakespeare's "Henry V," the king is about to lead his men into battle; he gives them a stirring oration urging them to arms. In part he says "And gentlemen in England now abed shall think themselves accursed they were not here." Well, I don't know if your friends and neighbors who are not here today will think themselves accursed 5 or 10 or 20 years hence, but I do think they might regret it because this is a significant day in the history of the Ohio River Valley.

It is significant because Jeffboat has reached a milestone by producing a seagoing vessel, the first since World War II. And it is because a milestone has been reached that our thoughts naturally turn today to our inland waterways, their importance to the Nation, to the Ohio River Valley, and to Louisville, Jeffersonville, and Jeffboat.

This is a day to remember because we see today the evidence that the Ohio River Valley is on the move in meeting one of its and the Nation's greatest needs—good transportation. The evidence is all about you.

IMPORTANCE TO THE NATION

The milestone reached today reminds us of the importance of the inland waterways to this Nation.

Water carriers today move 431 million tons of freight annually—14½ percent of all of the Nation's domestic freight. And they do it at an average cost to the shipper of 3 mills per ton-mile. This compares with an average cost to the shipper by rail that is five times that of the water freight cost or 15 mills per ton-mile. Truck freight service costs the shipper an average of 6½ cents per ton-mile—and average air cargo rates are in the range of 22 cents per ton-mile.

The savings realized on our waterway transportation are diffused widely throughout the Nation's economy. Coal is an excellent example of that and very important to us because almost 47 million tons moved on the Ohio River in 1964. The savings in transportation costs of coal is reflected, for example, in the price of electricity in home and factory.

The inland waterways are the workhorse of our transportation system. They have set the floor under transportation pricing in this country for many years and will continue to do so as long as water transportation is an effective competitor for business.

Our inland waterways have had a substantial effect on water resource development. Navigation requires that a stable supply of water be maintained in a channel in order to provide a standard operating depth for commercial vessels. In most water resource development projects, this is done by building a series of dams which create relatively

deep stillwater pools. But in order to feed that system, dams are built on headwaters and tributary streams to conserve water supplies which feed into the main channel. The water supplies created in these navigation projects are among the most precious and most valuable assets which this Nation has.

Our inland waterways are big business in America. The United States has 25,260 miles of usable, navigable inland channels exclusive of the Great Lakes; the Ohio River alone is 981 miles. In all, there are some 1,700 companies operating on the waterways, some 2,600 tank barges, more than 14,000 dry cargo barges and scows and approximately 4,000 towboats and tugs, representing a total investment of over \$1.6 billion.

The inland waterway business is booming. It stands in stark contrast to our oceangoing merchant marine which required a total Government subsidy during the calendar year 1964 of \$319 million for construction and operational differentials.

The inland waterway system is a recognized instrument of national defense.

IMPORTANCE TO OHIO RIVER VALLEY

This milestone reached today of producing the first seagoing vessel since World War II reminds us of the importance of inland waterways to Jeffersonville, Louisville, and southern Indiana.

In my congressional district, we talk a great deal about industrial development. And the history of recent years shows that off-river plants constitute the industrial base of much of southern Indiana: the powerplant in Madison, the distilleries in Lawrenceburg, Jeffboat, and the detergent and soap business in Jeffersonville. In the last decade a high proportion of industries' capital investment dollars have been spent in adding new facilities or expanding existing facilities along the navigable inland channels—or very close to these channels.

These waterways become vital to the communities. Traffic on the Ohio River doubles on an average of once every 11 years. It is now pushing 90 million tons annually. In 1963 there was an average of 64 tons for every household in Louisville. It is easy to see what an impact on income and prosperity the waterways have in the Louisville metropolitan area. And for each 100 water-based jobs, it is estimated there are 100 to 135 additional jobs created by the waterways.

In my congressional district, I have said repeatedly that we have no greater concern than the development of our water resources. I usually say this in the context of reservoirs, watersheds, flood control, and water supply which are very important to my district. But the same concern applies to the development of waterways which about the Ninth Congressional District in Dearborn, Ohio, Switzerland, Jefferson, and Clark Counties. A sound use of our waterways creates a firm industrial base, helps create jobs, produces income and brings economic vitality and prosperity to the region.

So I share your concern that the Nation's future is vitally dependent on full development of water resources, vigorous prosecution of a dynamic policy of water resource development. American national policy, from the writing at least of the Federalist papers and the famous Northwest Ordinance of 1787, has been for the free use of the Nation's rivers, harbors, lakes, and water courses.

The Northwest Ordinance said "Navigable waterways shall be common highways, and forever free—without any tax, impost or duty."

This policy is based on the sound recognition that the waterways have served and will continue to serve a variety of basic public purposes. Among them are unification of the country, furtherance of western expansion, defeat of sectionalism, low-cost

A640

"We are not at war with China, and we never will be unless they initiate it. However, Russia wouldn't be unhappy if we went to war with China," he said, adding chances are greater of war developing between Russia and China.

He said democracy would better suit the peoples of southeast Asia than communism because of the economic prosperity it would bring.

"With the exception of Russia, communism has stunted the economic growth of every nation in which it has developed," he said, contrasting this with the prosperity that earmarks the democratic nations of Japan and West Germany.

He said the United States should attempt to agriculturally develop the Mekong Delta, now the scene of some of the fiercest battles with the Vietcong, once the war is settled.

"It would be easy to pull out and go home—leaving this part of the world to be eaten up by the 'peaceful revolution' of communism, but this would not be the best thing to do.

"The war in Vietnam is giving Americans an opportunity to discover whether they really believe in democracy," he said.

"I believe we should support the President in his Vietnam policy—even if we think he's wrong," the Reverend Kenneth Shirk of Epiphany Church, Pleasantville, said, adding he personally supports Lyndon B. Johnson's war policy.

He said Americans have the right to conscientiously object to U.S. participation in the war so long as they don't break the law by so doing—as in the cases of burning draft cards.

The Reverend Shirk said the reason many America young men seem to be unenthusiastic about the war is because it is undeclared. He noted that if the war grew to the enormity of World War II, these men would rally to their Nation's side.

"We gain nothing by not having diplomatic relations with Red China," he said, citing the danger of that nation entering the Vietnam war.

He said he would favor admission of Red China to the United Nations "if she alters her terms for joining." Those terms call for immediate expulsion of Nationalist China from the U.N.

"It is no longer possible for a limited war to take place. If a world war begins, we are in for a major holocaust. And if a nuclear war develops, China's sheer numbers will be to her favor.

"If there is a nuclear war, the only thing we can do is run to the nearest bomb shelter—and pray to God," he said.

An Overriding Concern: The Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the executive vice president of the Minnesota Retail Federation, Inc., Mr. Thomas H. Hodgson, has provided me with samplings of a most unusual survey he has taken among small businesses in Minnesota. Mr. Hodgson stated in an accompanying letter that "A handful—of surveyed stores—may have annual sales of \$1 to \$2 million. A vast majority has sales substantially under \$300,000 or \$200,000, and some sell as little as \$50,000 to \$100,000."

The survey, according to Mr. Hodgson, revealed:

Thousands of small and large retailers in our State are having their troubles, strangely enough in a period of unprecedented expansion, high economic growth, and general national prosperity.

What are these troubles? Mr. Hodgson observed:

The overriding concern of the merchants centered on laws and growing governmental regulation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be helpful to Members of Congress to read for themselves representative observations of storekeepers in Minnesota about such matters as governmental relations, wage-hour legislation, and unemployment compensation. Under unanimous consent I insert these appropriate survey comments in the RECORD today.

SURVEY COMMENTS

GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Government's regulations and reports require full-time secretary which raises our costs higher proportionally. (Small store in town of 3,000 population.)

We have all but lost our voice in Government. The boys in Washington couldn't care less about what is going on in Windom, Minn., even when we tell them. Unfortunately, our State government is acting the same way.

The Federal Government and also the State have lost sight of the small businessman. They think the small businessman does one-half million in volume and up and that they can afford some of the garbage the Government is trying to pass off on us. What about the guy who does \$100,000 or less, or under \$200,000. We can't afford high-priced bookkeepers for Government recordkeeping and for keeping within the varied and sundry laws that we are under. We do it ourselves. Tom, we have all we can do with trying to keep our heads above water.

Federal interference through wage-hour law, medicare, raising unemployment benefits for undeserving people.

Biggest problem—growing encroachment of Government on business. Large firms can add people to handle these things at a direct cost to the company. "The small merchant doesn't have the wherewithal to employ additional personnel and * * * is forced to assume the duty himself or split it among other present employees to the detriment of their present duties.

Any governmental regulations that don't take into account the size of the business and the locally oriented problems cannot be equitable and can only serve to crowd out the small guy.

The head of a large State retail association lists as the first problem governmental regulations and taxes.

Our greatest problem is government regulations. Because we are small and I have no one to advise us on our individual problems, we never know if we are properly complying or not. (Town population about 500.)

Continued takeover by Federal Government by more and more regulations.

Initiative-killing bills—repeal of 14(b) (taking away a man's rights), reducing to \$250,000 the qualification to come under the new minimum wage and hour law and federalization of unemployment compensation amendments to eliminate experience rating and dispensing our money from Washington instead of locally.

"The greatest problem the small retailer has today is to be under Federal control of wages and hours. The Government says that Federal control * * * does not effect the small retailer but it definitely does. Many of us are next door to J. C. Penney's, Woolworth's,

Montgomery Ward, etc. How can we hire girls for \$1 to \$1.25 an hour and have the girls next door receiving \$1.75? It will force us to pay \$1.75 but at the same time we will have to operate our business with one or two less girls, which will create more unemployment.

Another problem has to do with the clerical work we do for the government. It's getting more voluminous daily. The government owns a lot of computers * * * why doesn't it go into a timesharing deal with smaller retailers so that we could feed the information for our firm into their computer. It could be programed the way the government wanted it so that the government reports would all be on time and correctly processed by their own computer. Or is that too naive? In the absence of that, how about rebates for our doing government work, or the government sending someone to do the work for us?

Recordkeeping. "We are expected to keep records on so many things: wages and hours worked, social security, withholding taxes, unemployment compensation, and many more. It's time consuming and expensive.

"Business today is not working for itself but for the government due to the many unnecessary rules, laws, regulations, etc. Regulations are running rampant and not until we can get a conservative government that is not labor controlled can we start digging out of this mess. Government today channels everything to interest the voter and it is the vote that keeps them in power and builds for further power.

"We have many employees in our store and community who own their own homes, and cars, are debt free, and have sent or are sending children to colleges, who earn less than \$3,000 per year. We do not appreciate 'Big Brother' in Washington telling them they are poverty stricken and neither do they. The government wage scale and ideas of poverty are not applicable to every geographical and economic area of the country.

"Living in northern Minnesota we have seen what happens to the American Indians when they are put on reservations and become wards of the government. We are forced to be pessimistic about the future of our country when we are faced with the rising trend toward making everyone in the country a ward of the government. The people should be running the government, not the government running the people."

Too many duplicate Government forms (for reporting) that take up too much of a retailer's time.

"It is especially difficult for the small merchant to assume additional duties foisted on his business by the Government because his primary means to stay competitive are his abilities to use his imagination and implement his programs. When tied down with routine duties his efficiency is curtailed and his creativity dulled. Without the small merchant working in his most efficient manner, the sociological and economic problems may make some of the present problems in these areas small by comparison."

WAGE-HOUR

"We need some definite guidelines on wage-hour regulations having to do with commissioned big-ticket salesmen. We don't know how liable we are on minimum wages for these people."

Because he's doing a little more than \$250,000 volume a year, a merchant located in a very small rural town fears being saddled with unrealistic wage-hour controls.

Federal wage and hour regulations have "kept our expenses too heavy for the past 3 years and made it almost impossible for our store to show a profit. A 10-cent-an-hour raise to our employees costs us \$8,000 to \$9,000 per year. We can't recover from one jolt before we get another."

"The restrictions, regulations (wage-hour) and compensation required to meet the Fed-

try in industrial and urban areas may be necessary, but the draft regulations of the Department of Commerce are most punitive in their effect. I feel that their adoption would at best be an unfair and unwarranted step toward the complete destruction of a valuable advertising industry and at worst is a direct violation of both the spirit and the letter of the Highway Beautification Act.

H.R. 12410 Provides Education and Other Benefits for Veterans of Service After January 31, 1955

SPEECH
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously support H.R. 12410, the bill to provide education and other benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955.

This bill was unanimously approved by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. It is a good bill, and a major step forward in providing cold war veterans realistic compensation for service in Vietnam and elsewhere.

The bill is more far reaching than the bill passed by the Senate last year, and it contains most of the provisions of my own GI cold war bill, H.R. 12215, which I introduced on January 20, 1966, and which extended the provisions of the Korean conflict GI bill.

The new GI bill provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving after January 31, 1955, on the basis of a month of training for each month of service up to 3 years. It also provides the same educational benefits as those provided by the Korean conflict GI bill.

The loan-guarantee provisions are the same as for veterans of the Korean service. The Veterans' Administration guarantees as much as \$7,500, and direct loans also are authorized where private financing is not available, up to \$17,500.

H.R. 12410 also contains all of the important provisions for medical care and job training for veterans as were provided in the Korean conflict GI bill.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am glad that so many of the provisions of my bill have been included in H.R. 12410. I am satisfied that this bill is complete in all essential details and will adequately provide for veterans of the Vietnam conflict as well as areas of potential conflict.

I am confident that the President will sign this legislation promptly.

During the congressional recess it was my privilege, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to travel to Vietnam, and to observe firsthand the hazards faced by American fighting men, and to see their dedication to duty in the swamps and jungles under the most difficult conditions.

It was also my privilege to visit our troops in Korea which are holding the cease-fire line in that sensitive and important area which was won at such great cost.

Every Member of Congress who has visited these areas has been impressed with the quality of character and dedication of American fighting men who are serving on the frontiers of freedom. Today our servicemen are serving under combat or near-combat conditions in many areas of the world. During the period of time which is covered by this bill, our Nation has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, Laos, and now Vietnam. As the committee report says, "The perpetual cold war condition, with its crises, compulsory military service, and expanded overseas commitments, makes this bill necessary if our servicemen, during this tense period of history, are to receive equitable treatment."

In Vietnam, in Korea, in the Dominican Republic, in Berlin, and in other posts which are now, or may at any moment become hot spots in this cold war period, American fighting men must be ready at any moment to make great sacrifices to preserve our precious heritage of freedom. The cost of stopping aggression is a high one.

It is, therefore, entirely proper and fitting that we at home express our gratitude to and support of our fighting men of the Armed Forces now, as we have in the past, to veterans of World War II, and the Korean conflict, and of World War I. In my opinion, there is no better way to do this than to establish the permanent program provided in H.R. 12410, which will assist these men in obtaining educational benefits and other assistance upon their return to civilian life.

Those who serve in the Armed Forces in this cold war period shoulder a disproportionate burden of citizenship. While they are exposed to great hazards in the service of their country, other young men of their age at home are preparing for occupational or professional careers.

Here at home we must make certain sacrifices to insure that our Armed Forces personnel can, when they return, pick up their lives and progress at a normal rate in our rapidly changing society and economy. We must assist our veterans to adjust to our economy at home when they return, as we pray they will.

Clergymen Back President's Vietnamese Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, an article of great significance appeared on Monday, February 7, in the Atlantic City

Press, the leading daily newspaper in Atlantic County, New Jersey's Second District, which I have the honor to represent. This article containing the views of Atlantic County clergymen on our participation in the Vietnamese warfare makes worthwhile reading for the ideas which my district's men of the cloth express, and I would like to reproduce it here and commend it to my colleagues for their illumination.

The Atlantic City Press article follows:
CLERGYMEN FROM AREA SUPPORT L.B.J.'S VIET POLICY

(By Joseph Di Leo)

A shadow has been cast across the face of southeast Asia. It is all encompassing, lethal in character and woven with deception.

Today nearly 200,000 American GI's are engaged in the deadly business of battling the elusive Vietcong troops who lurk in the sweltering jungles of war-torn South Vietnam.

For these men, the reality of war has become a way of life.

Whether the limited war in Vietnam will mushroom into a worldwide conflict undoubtedly is uppermost in their minds. Whether these men will see their families again is a matter of grave concern to them.

"What is the Mekong Delta, and why must I die there?" American soldiers in Vietnam often wonder. "Who will remember me—and who will dig my grave?"

The loneliness and doubt felt by many GI's in Vietnam undoubtedly has been heightened by the variety of opinions among Americans as to the feasibility and morality of the war.

However, a poll of Atlantic City area clergymen indicates they support the President's policy regarding the war in Vietnam.

On Sunday night, the press called three local clergymen for their comments on the war. "Americans to decide who will lead the Nation. Our decision is demonstrated at the polls on election day. After that we can only have confidence in our leaders," Rabbi Jerome S. Lipsitz of Temple Beth El, Margate, said.

Rabbi Lipsitz, who served as an Army chaplain during the Korean war, said the United States has a "vital commitment" to the defense of South Vietnam but added we should attempt to peacefully settle the war.

Citing the similarities between the Korean and Vietnam wars, the rabbi said "we shouldn't draw lines, such as the line that divides North and South Korea, in seeking a settlement to the war."

"If we have to negotiate along such lines, we should only accept a divided Vietnam on a temporary basis," he said, predicting that North and South Korea will be reunited within 20 years.

Rabbi Lipsitz noted that during the Korean war American GI's were beset by frustration because they had to fight their way to the tops of mountains like Old Baldy and Pork Chop Hill—in a nation so distant from the United States that it hardly seemed worth the trouble.

"The situation is similar in Vietnam, and the cause is just as worthwhile," he added.

The Reverend Charles F. Rinck of Grace Lutheran Church, Somers Point, said, "The United States must stop the spread of communism."

He added that he supported the policy of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur to extend the Korean war into Red China.

When asked if he thinks the United States should bomb Hanoi, the minister said: "If we can fire one bullet in this war, we can bomb Hanoi. The scope of the war is not so important as we make it out to be."

However, he noted that bombing Hanoi may have dangerous consequences in that it brings Red China into the war.

It must have been pleasing to the great liberal bloc of Congress, which views the Federal Treasury as a vast and unending source of loot and solutions for all of mankind's ills.

It must, however, trouble anyone who has watched TV's late-show pitchmen perform great feats of financial legerdemain by which boobs are convinced they can get something for practically nothing.

Quite frankly, we don't see how he can have it all: to rebuild cities, to provide additional largess and benefits to all, to expand medical care (he even mentioned physical examinations) and to fight a costly war and close the budget to near balance (if you happen to think a billion dollars or so is an insignificant sum) and not tax us until we are bloody.

His expanded Great Society will, of course, expand the Federal dominion in the States and the cities. This would be further heightened by his contemplated revision of workman's compensation, Federal intrusions into jury selection and what seems to be the beginnings of a true Federal police force to enforce special Federal laws to be created for the protection of civil rights workers.

Laws are needed, he said, "to strengthen the authority of Federal courts to try those who murder, attack, or intimidate either civil rights workers or others exercising their constitutional rights."

The conduct of southern juries and courts does, of course, add persuasiveness to this approach. But it would be to enter a realm of constitutional upheaval, a swift approach to the "Big Brother" state and, we think, to kill a swarm of gnats with atomic weapons.

The foreign policy portion of the address contained no surprises and seems to have encountered only that opposition which could have been expected. It was a simple reassertion. It went into no additional detail as to present aims in Vietnam. It revealed again that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are having none of our overtures for peace.

Somewhat significantly, the President received great applause when he called for a constitutional amendment to increase congressional terms to 4 years. Doubly significant, and giving a quick study of the rubber stamp 89th Congress, was the enthusiastic applause which greeted the President's praise of its efforts last year, which were truly remarkable as to quantity if not quality.

It does not seem as if we are to have a year of close study of that which has been wrought with so many imperfections and gross miscalculations. If the Great Society leaks a bit the solution apparently is to load it rather than patch it, which, in the case of gas balloons and tires can be disastrous.

U.N. Assignment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam issue has been referred to the proper authority with the U.S. request for the U.N. Security Council to use its "immense prestige in finding a prompt solution."

The task will not be easy. But we can take hope, remembering that it was in the U.N. corridors that the Berlin blockade problem was finally resolved.

Moscow and Washington were not able to find a way by themselves but conversations in the United Nations led to a settlement.

Taking the Vietnam problem to the United Nations was hailed by the New York Journal-American, which stated:

It is a victory for the United States and the administration because it dramatizes before all the world the sincerity and persistence of the President's drive for an honorable peace—a truly impressive effort that has explored every possible diplomatic approach.

It adds:

It is a victory for the United Nations because it affirms that body's basic reason for existence, which is to restore and maintain peace wherever it is violated.

Because it deals with a matter of such vital urgency, I suggest that the editorial to which I have referred be published in the RECORD—and it is herewith submitted.

A BIG WIN IN U.N.

The United States, President Johnson's administration, and the United Nations itself, have won an important victory in the vote of the Security Council permitting a full-scale debate on the Vietnam war.

It is a victory for the United States and the administration because it dramatizes before all the world the sincerity and persistence of the President's drive for an honorable peace—a truly impressive effort that has explored every possible diplomatic approach.

It is a victory for the United Nations because it affirms that body's basic reason for existence, which is to restore and maintain peace wherever it is violated.

The 9 to 2 vote (with four abstentions) of the Security Council is, on the other hand, a shameful indictment of the Soviet Union and its curious companion, France, which led the opposition to the debate. Russia voted "No" along with Bulgaria. France took transparent refuge in abstaining, along with Mali, Uganda, and Nigeria, which was a "chicken" way of saying "No." They all, in effect, were acting against the primary purpose of the U.N.

Our Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg handled the administration's case magnificently in turning back the vitriolic attack on the United States by Soviet Delegate Nikolai T. Fedorenko.

The little nation of Jordan, which cast the decisive vote, deserves applause for seeing the issue clearly and acting accordingly.

It is not a conclusive victory, of course, because the vote on the U.S. resolution itself is yet to come and opens the way for a veto. But it was a big victory just the same.

Intent of Congress Was Not To Destroy the Billboard Industry, But Rather To Develop a Program of Beautification With Reasonable Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Department of Commerce published a draft of standards which they are proposing to regulate the use of billboards on Federal highways in

cities and industrial areas. I feel very strongly that the draft standards represent a serious misinterpretation of the intent of Congress in passing the Highway Beautification Act, and will seriously jeopardize, perhaps almost destroy, the outdoor advertising industry.

I supported the President's highway beautification program when it came to us on the floor of the House, and I still support it. I feel that we can vastly improve the beauty of our countryside by fair and judicious control of billboard advertising. The general appearance of our cities, too, can be improved by limited control of billboards. However, no interpretation of the Highway Beautification Act can accurately describe the intent of Congress as being desirous of the destruction of the outdoor advertising. On the contrary, the bill was designed to assist the outdoor advertising in its development consistent with the mutual desire to improve the appearance of our cities and countryside.

Therefore, the draft standards came as quite a shock to many, for they go far beyond the stated intent of Congress and indeed in some places violate the language of the law itself. The standards are also in violation of the expressed intent of Commerce Secretary John Connor, in his explanation of the proposal as originally put forth by the administration.

When the House of Representatives debated the highway beautification bill, as it was passed by the Senate, it passed the Tuten amendment which called for the adoption of standards "consistent with customary use." The standards proposed by the Department of Commerce are, I feel, in violation of this language.

The draft standards would impose a size limitation of 300 square feet for any billboard within 150 feet of the roadway, require a minimum setback of 25 feet for all signs, limit the height of billboards to 30 feet, and require that signs be placed at least 500 feet apart with the maximum limit of 6 per mile. A prominent businessman in my district rightly referred to the size limitation as a "postage stamp" approach and said that advertising effectiveness would be seriously hampered by the imposition of such limitations. The requirement of a 150-foot setback for larger signs is extremely unrealistic and unfair in that such setbacks are virtually impossible to find in industrial or heavily populated areas. The imposition of a minimum 25-foot setback for all signs would, at least in the industrial areas of my district, cause the destruction or removal of a large percentage of billboards and result in an unreasonable financial loss to outdoor advertising companies. The height limitation would, of course, eliminate almost all advertising on top of buildings. And most important of all, the proposed regulation limiting the number of billboards to 6 per mile would in itself virtually eliminate the industry.

None of these regulations can by any stretch of the imagination be considered as following "customary usage" as required by the law. I certainly feel that some regulation of the billboard indus-

Young Cincinnatians Learn Skills in Classes at Job Corps Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 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 sixth 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.

YOUNG CINCINNATIANS LEARN SKILLS IN
CLASSES AT JOB CORPS CAMPS

(By Margaret Josten)

Camp Kilmer, N.J., may have seen more exciting days—if not in World War II when it was the U.S. staging area for the European theater, perhaps in 1956, when it was a temporary dwelling for refugees from the Hungarian revolution.

Now the sprawling complex of weatherworn barracks on the Jersey coast is the showcase of the Job Corps, major youth program of the war against poverty. It has never been the subject of a headline screaming "trouble."

Because of the headlines about a few of the 75 camps strung throughout the Nation, however, the visitor to Kilmer is pleasantly surprised when he sees no evidence of the young ruffian who has become the Job Corps man's prototype for many who read the newspapers.

The International Telephone and Telegraph Corp., a leader in electronics and communications, operates this camp for the Government. And it appears to be giving about 1,200 young men between the ages of 16 and 21 the kind of skills which may one day produce a reduction in welfare rolls.

Depending upon their talents the young men can take courses in elementary and advanced electricity, welding, logistics, automobile body repair and finishing, refrigeration, appliance repair, the building trades, office machine operation, even cooking.

"We have been successful so far," says John W. Guilfoyle, IT&T vice president.

"Kilmer graduates have been hired by large and small firms and have been accepted by the Armed Forces," Mr. Guilfoyle adds. "We have every indication that American business is opening the doors to the graduates of this and every other training center."

Businesses like IT&T, itself planning to hire at least 100 Job Corps graduates, were chosen to run the camps for approximately 40,000 young men and women throughout the Nation.

The businesses know the problems and they know how to get results, explains R. Sargent Shriver, Director, U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

"Kilmer management knows what a body repair shop is," Mr. Shriver says. "It has had experience; there is no play-acting."

Although there are no Job Corps camps near Cincinnati, well over 100 young men and women from this area are in installations which have been set up in both urban and rural centers.

A number of Cincinnatians are at Kilmer, which was named for the "Trees" composer.

Cecil Hamilton, 18, formerly a resident of Elsinore Street in Mt. Adams, has gained 32 pounds since he arrived at the center in May 1965. He is learning to be an automobile

mechanic and hopes he may one day put his skills to use in Cincinnati.

Young Hamilton, who recently took first place in Kilmer's pool shooting tournament, says, "There's a good chance for every boy here."

Then there is George C. Vanderpool, 17, 1703 Carl Street, who completed the 8th grade at Heindol Junior High School. He, as well as all other corpsmen, is enrolled in an academic program. But he, too, is learning the basics of automobile mechanics.

Richard W. Clift, 8406 St. Clair St., says he likes everything about the Job Corps but the food. (It is basically the same as that served in Army camps.)

At any rate young Clift is also learning to be an automobile mechanic, apparently a popular vocation here and in other camps. He wants to return to Cincinnati.

Among Job Corpsmen who visited the Youth Opportunity Center, 108 E. Seventh St., while home on holiday education:

Willie Curry, 19, 1400 Linn Street, stationed at Camp Gary, San Marcos, Tex. He had gone as far as the 11th grade and had done no more than weekend restaurant work before leaving Cincinnati. Now he is learning welding.

Ralph Bartholomew, 20, 148 W. 73d Street, Carthage, stationed at Mexican Springs, N.M. He had attended school until the 10th grade, but now is becoming acquainted with the basic elements of electricity.

Harry Needom, 21, 326 W. McMicken Avenue, now at Camp Gary, San Marcos, Tex.

Young Needom says he could neither read nor write acceptably before entering the Job Corps. "At first I couldn't even read letters from home," he declared, adding, "But I'm improving a lot."

Now he is learning laundry management, explaining, "Some hospitals are begging for people who know this work."

OEO officials ask how anybody can condemn a system which is zeroing in on such problems.

VN

Clear Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, in ending the 37-day pause in the bombing of targets in North Vietnam. President Johnson said he did so because "only denunciation and rejection" came from Hanoi and Peiping in reply to his peace offers, and because a continuation of the pause would cost American and Allied lives.

In this peace-searching period the only fact brought to light, according to an editorial in the Columbus Dispatch, "was the stubborn intention of Peiping and Hanoi to press their luck to the bitter end."

The Dispatch states that:

Behind the President's decision was a reckoning of the cost in lives and money of a continued diminished military effort against the lesser overall cost of definitive action.

The newspaper believes that—

The world that pays attention to the truth is well aware, after the 37-day lull, of the U.S. good intentions and of the sincerity of our peace offer.

Because this editorial gives such a clear analysis of a subject of great concern to all Americans and to all the world, I insert it in the RECORD:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Feb. 1, 1966]

SECOND LESSON BEGINS NOW

After a fruitless 5-week suspension of bombing of North Vietnam during which our pursuit of a negotiated peace was insolently rejected by Hanoi, President Johnson has made the reluctant but inevitable decision again to bring to bear the might of the U.S. Air Force against the centers of support and supply which abet the Vietcong attack on South Vietnam.

The only fact brought to light in the search for a way to the negotiating table was the stubborn intention of Peiping and Hanoi to press their luck to the bitter end.

Behind the President's decision was a reckoning of the cost in lives and money of a continued diminished military effort against the lesser overall cost of definitive action.

In ordering renewed bombardment of North Vietnam, the President made it clear he still holds the door open for Hanoi and Peiping should they find negotiation to be more profitable than further fighting.

The world that pays attention to truth is well aware, after the 37-day lull, of the U.S. good intentions and of the sincerity of our peace offer.

What remains now is to convince the Peiping-Hanoi axis that we are dedicated to the defense of democracy whether by conversations around a table or bombing around the clock.

L.B.J.'s State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, developments in the past 4 weeks demonstrate the insight expressed in an editorial from the St. Paul Dispatch of January 13, 1966, published the day after President Johnson's state of the Union message to Congress and the American people. This editorial accurately places in print the thoughts that many of us had after listening to the President.

The editorial follows:

L.B.J.'S STATE OF THE UNION

It will be possible to analyze fairly President Johnson's plans to provide both guns and butter only as specific proposals are sent to Congress, but on the face of it his state of the Union address Wednesday night comes across as an election year document full of a good deal of windy nonsense. We are to enlarge and broaden the Great Society, to provide for every human want. We are to continue to support much of the world, even, as we heard, help educate it, and we are to pursue the war in Vietnam with vigor. All of this, so help us, at no additional cost to the taxpayer save in resumed excise taxes on automobiles and telephones.

This was an address filled with glad tidings for big labor, despite his admonition to both business and labor to keep an eye on inflation and despite his plea for some sort of weapon to settle such strikes as that which tied up public transportation in New York City for 2½ weeks.

February 9, 1966

ANALYSIS OF SENATE VIETNAM STAND

The William S. White article on this page today dealing with Senators' positions on Vietnam policy is interesting and, we think, significant.

The columnist asserts that strong opposition to resumed bombing of North Vietnam is limited to 10 or less Senators. There is an additional group of perhaps 25 who have expressed themselves as being opposed in varying degree to bombing "right now." Concerning these Senators, who kept hoping in the face of all the evidence that something would turn up to make bombing unnecessary, White writes:

"Once the hard decision has been taken at the White House to resume what must be resumed to protect our troops, this bloc of 25 will vanish like the mists after sunrise."

Concerning the 10 or fewer who would "be left manning the barricades," the columnist declares that their position is in fact no position at all. They simply want to withdraw, which means surrender.

And that, according to this analysis, is why there hasn't been and won't be any "great debate" on the issue. For, White declares, at some point these Senators "would be required at long last to say plainly what it is they really want."

So, White estimates, no more than 10 percent of the Senate, and perhaps slightly less, would like to "cut and run." Ninety percent would back the President and his advisers on measures they consider necessary.

The Chronicle agrees with the majority viewpoint.

Minnesota Precinct Caucuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota politics is among the most exciting in the Nation. In each election year the two major political parties are required by law to conduct precinct caucuses in each precinct in the State. Both the Minnesota Republican Party and the Minnesota Democratic Farmer-Labor Party are conducting these caucuses this winter. The Minneapolis Tribune has done an outstanding job of building interest in precinct caucuses through a series of three articles on its editorial pages. Because I believe so deeply in the precinct caucus as the proper instrument for citizen participation in politics and because I hope that other States will follow the Minnesota lead, I am inserting in the RECORD today this fine series of articles written by Miss Miriam Alburn of the Tribune editorial-opinion-page staff:

[From the Minneapolis, Minn. Tribune, Jan. 1, 1966]

PRECINCT CAUCUSES GIVE VOTERS CHANCE TO
SPEAK THEIR MINDS
(By Miriam Alburn)

Both major political parties are gearing up for biennial precinct caucuses—to be held February 7 to 16 by the Minnesota Republican Party, and March 1 all over the State by the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party.

Why should the average voter bother to go to a precinct caucus?

To the uninitiated, the very word "caucus" may suggest factional political wrang-

ling, or a kind of grubby, low-level organizational meeting that only the "pros" find fascinating.

What matters to most voters—according to this casual reasoning—is voting for the candidates for important offices. And that comes much later.

These impressions, however, don't fit the realities of the precinct caucus. And those who stay away don't know what they're missing.

The caucuses form the broadest base of the Nation's political pyramid and serve as the source of much of the political structure and activity that follow. Many candidates for both low and high offices get their initial push at the precinct level.

Moreover, little groups of citizens gathered together on caucus night have been known to launch ideas that could change the character of a village government or command the attention of the National Congress.

Essentially, the precinct is the neighborhood unit of political organization. And so the precinct caucuses are held in ordinary neighborhood locations—in home living rooms, school gyms, church basements, corner coffeshops and the like. The group is usually small and the mood informal, and everybody gets a chance to talk, or not talk, as he chooses.

One of the few things leaders of both parties agree upon is the importance of broad participation in precinct caucuses. They urge attendance by professionals and average voters, those familiar with such meetings and newcomers, older and younger adults.

"No matter what you hope to achieve politically, the precinct caucus is a good place to start," says George Thiss, State Republican chairman.

"By not attending, you hand over the political process to someone else," George Farr, State DFL chairman, points out.

For those inclined to be suspicious of party systems, the professionals point out that the best guarantee the public has against machine political control is high attendance at the local caucuses. They serve as a great leveller: The high-ranking politician in his home precinct has a single vote, and so does the man or woman who never went to a political meeting before.

The questions asked by newcomers often provide an informative, useful balance in discussion of candidates, issues, resolutions, and party philosophy.

Even those in attendance who choose to listen and remain silent lend some stability to the situation. Their votes and their mere presence as witnesses assure that a little handful of leaders can't take over in ways not approved by the other voters.

The League of Woman Voters of Minneapolis, as part of its continuing program of throwing a bipartisan spotlight on politics and government, will sponsor a precinct caucus kickoff luncheon at 1 p.m. Wednesday at the Pick-Nicollet Hotel. It is planned as a briefing session for the public, with talks by both State party chairmen.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Feb. 1, 1966]

"UNORGANIZED" PRECINCT CAUCUS IS A GRASS-
ROOTS FREE-FOR-ALL
(By Miriam Alburn)

A contingent of Russians had arrived in Minneapolis to introduce an art exhibit, and it occurred to one of their official hostesses that they might be interested in attending an old-fashioned American precinct caucus.

The scene was a church basement in the second ward, with precinct groups meeting separately before merging for a ward meeting. It was crowded. It was noisy. For the strangers, it was difficult to figure out who was doing what or why.

But the Russians were fascinated and impressed.

"It seemed so informal, so unorganized to them—but they really did see democracy at work," one of their escorts recalled the other day.

"They saw nominations come from the floor. They heard resolutions debated. They witnessed competition for delegate positions, and they were surprised at the number of articulate people there. They had heard about this sort of politics, but had to see it to believe it.

"They did comment, however, that the process seemed wasteful of time and energy," we were told.

By American values, the precinct caucus, however chaotic or inefficient or frustrating at moments, is never a waste of time.

The very freedom and diversity of discussion which made it seem cumbersome and unsystematic to the Russians are what make it a cherished grassroots free-for-all to American voters.

If you've never been near one before, you, too, may wonder whether you're really helping the democratic system—as political leaders say so nobly in speeches—or just contributing to the confusion.

"Who, Me—Go to My Precinct Caucus?" is the title of a folder prepared by the St. Paul League of Women Voters and widely used as a primer. "Yes, you. Take part in the party of your choice," is the primer's obvious answer.

State law protects the system—by requiring parties to set dates, times, and locations and by defining a few ground rules. Other details of procedure have grown up by custom within the two parties and are not exactly alike.

Who is eligible to participate? "You may attend if you are a qualified voter or will be by the next general election. * * * You should be in agreement with the principles of the particular party and have either voted or affiliated with the party at the last general election, or intend to do so at the next general election," explains the primer.

By law, a precinct caucus must remain in session for 1 hour. By practice, it may last much longer. Democrats move directly into ward meetings (the next step up), the same evening at the same places. Republicans hold ward conventions at later dates. Both are laying groundwork for the significant county conventions, legislative district meetings, and State conventions.

Voters at a precinct caucus start by signing a roster, and a temporary chairman launches the session. A permanent caucus chairman and secretary are elected. Then the business moves on to election of permanent officers (for a 2-year period) and convention delegates. Any nominee may be questioned about his stand on public issues and candidates for higher offices.

The resolution field is wide open. Some participants come with prepared statements. Some may tentatively voice concern about problems as far apart as dog leashing and Vietnam—and if others agree, the ideas will be put into resolution form for voting.

In 1964, Republican precinct caucuses were electrified by the controversy over Senator Barry Goldwater. The philosophical split between "moderates" and "conservatives" may again erupt at the precinct level.

In both parties, the caucuses will offer opportunities for the first voter-level tests of support for candidates, announced or unannounced, for Governor. And leaders of both parties expect lively discussion of tax problems.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, February 2, 1966]

PARTIES NOT ALWAYS SWAYED BY IDEOLOGY
(By Miriam Alburn)

Precinct caucus night is the beginning of a new period in politics—the time when each party begins to renew itself from the bottom

Standard-Star and Mr. Allard's article will be printed in the RECORD following my remarks:

[From the New Rochelle (N.Y.) Standard-Star, Jan. 25, 1966]

WESTCHESTER TODAY—NEW ROCHELLE VISTA: LOCAL PEACE CORPS

VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—a domestic version of the Peace Corps, is represented in New Rochelle in the person of Joseph Allard, of Lowell, Mass., supervisor for the antipoverty project known as Paycheck, Inc., which provides jobs and job training for disadvantaged youngsters.

Mr. Allard, 22, says of Paycheck, "It's sort of a private version of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, only better." He has been working hand-in-hand for 6 months with Paycheck director, Boris Feinman, a New Rochelle businessman who set up the organization in July 1964.

The corporation runs a series of small private enterprises and employs only teenagers who come from low-income families on welfare. "Our biggest enterprise," Mr. Allard stated, "is a 450-car parking lot. The lot is located on a vacant urban renewal parcel downtown, which has been undeveloped for 10 years."

In running the lot, Mr. Allard continued, the boys learn how to keep books, manage their own time records, file the necessary taxes and learn all about economic self-reliance. Mr. Allard's job consists of supervising youngsters, giving them supplementary tutoring in English, mathematics and providing counsel for them and their families.

Mr. Allard is enthusiastic about Paycheck, and thinks it is well worth copying in towns and cities all over the country.

SELLING OLD GLORY

"Another enterprise we created," he said "was selling American flags door-to-door. The flags cost \$3 wholesale and the boys sell them to residents for \$6. In the process they learn the value of a smile when they deal with the public.

"This project is one of the hottest things going in the whole country in the war on poverty," Mr. Allard added. "Not only are the kids involved, but the whole community has taken an interest and cooperated with us 100 percent.

"The reason this project is so great," he stated, "is that it teaches these youngsters the risk of loss, and how to run a business efficiently. The corporation is not a plaything. If we don't earn enough money to stay in business, we fold and they lose their jobs."

Among the other enterprises run by the youngsters are office cleaning, house painting and a restaurant.

"It takes 12 youngsters," he continued, "to run the parking lot, at one time we had as many as 40 youths involved in the various enterprises." They are constantly looking for new services they can perform which will make money.

The son of Evevine G., and the late Arthur J. Allard, he is a Lowell High School graduate. He also attended Northern Essex College in Haverhill, Mass., and the University of Maryland School of Social Work.

FOR THE LESS FORTUNATE

Why did he volunteer for VISTA? He was sitting home watching television when it suddenly struck him how lucky he was. He resolved to go out and do something to help those persons less fortunate than he.

"I felt there was so much to do in this world, and at first I thought I would join the Peace Corps," he said. "But then I realized that we have some very big problems right here in our own country, that there was a tremendous opportunity here and that I had to take it."

Mr. Feinman speaks very highly of the young man, describing him as "dedicated, pleasant, knowledgeable, likeable, hard-working, capable and personable."

PAYCHECK

(By Joseph R. Allard, VISTA volunteer assigned to Paycheck)

Operation Paycheck is a youth-oriented business training program which strives to reach the disadvantaged youth of the city by providing job opportunities for them. It's helping to answer President Johnson's request to employ youth and to train them for the future.

Paycheck creates businesses for the sole purpose of providing jobs for youth in need of such assistance. The entire staff, consists of youngsters 14 to 16 years of age. Examples of such jobs created are: a 450-acre parking lot, a snack bar at a municipal marina, a sales division selling American flags door to door, office maintenance work, sign painting, impresarios who sponsored a concert, concessionaires for concerts. During the recent water shortage in New York, the youngsters pumped water from city lakes and sold it to residents so that they might save their prized shrubbery.

MORE THAN JUST A JOB

While the youngsters earn \$1.25 an hour, they receive individual counseling as well as family counseling. Also constant contact with New Rochelle's senior high school and its two junior high schools is maintained. Both school guidance counselor and Paycheck help iron out the youngsters problems.

Paycheck stimulates youngsters to observe better working habits such as promptness, responsibility, courtesy, and good health habits.

Education and community involvement is stressed. Tours of various civic agencies are part of their job training. Tours of the New York Stock Exchange, courthouse to witness a trial, city council meetings and the like, are included. These are intended to make the youth aware of their responsibility to the community and to prepare them to play their role as future leaders.

Paycheck provides a real and practical service to the community. All its created businesses have provided the people of New Rochelle with needed services.

When an employee leaves Paycheck, he has a darn good idea of employer-employee relationship, he knows what to expect and what is expected of him. This is a service well appreciated by all employers.

One of the most unique qualities of Paycheck is that it is the only "privately financed," profitmaking antipoverty program in the United States, which donates to other charities. Certainly this is an ideal example of the poor helping themselves.

As President Johnson said, "We must open the doors of opportunity. But we must also equip our people to walk through these doors." Paycheck has opened the doors and it has trained its people and equipped them to walk thru these doors to a brighter future and a more fruitful life.

Welcome Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, there was a new and welcome note of realism in President Johnson's message on foreign aid.

We must concentrate on countries that are not hostile to us—

He said—

and that give solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves.

The New York Journal-American recently hailed this as a welcome change, commenting that this should be "pleasing news to American taxpayers who, far too often in the past, have seen their money go to countries tacitly or openly hostile to us, or 'neutral' against us."

Because the editorial praising this message makes good sense, I suggest that others may want to see it, and I herewith offer it for the RECORD.

WELCOME CHANGE

There was one refreshing emphasis in President Johnson's foreign aid message to Congress, calling for \$3.4 billion in fiscal 1967. The President is committed to giving more help to countries that help themselves.

"We must concentrate," he said, "on countries not hostile to us that give solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves."

That should be pleasing news to American taxpayers who, far too often in the past, have seen their money go to countries tacitly or openly hostile to us, or "neutral" against us.

Congress has debatable topics in the proposals for a long-term, 5-year authority for foreign aid, and for the global program itself to be split into separate economic and arms aid bills.

But taxpayers owe the President a vote of thanks for steering foreign aid onto a more realistic course.

Analysis Given

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, before the announcement that bombing in North Vietnam would begin again, there was widespread discussion in this country as to whether it should or should not be renewed. Now, however, once the decision was made and clearly stated, the Nation has united behind the administration.

The columnist, William S. White, predicted that this would happen, and one of the newspapers, the Houston Chronicle, which prints his column commented that White's analysis "is interesting and, we think, significant."

According to his analysis, there has not been and will not be any great debate on the issue.

White estimates that only a fraction of the Senate would want to "cut and run," and that 90 percent would "back the President and his advisers on measures they consider necessary." The newspaper adds:

The Chronicle agrees with the majority viewpoint.

I found the editorial to be of great interest and in the belief that others will also find it helpful, I offer it for the RECORD.

their political leaders to win the war in Vietnam for them, and they have been given encouragement by a few noisy Americans, including some Members of Congress.

This is the only logical conclusion that can be drawn from their completely negative response to President Johnson's unprecedented peace initiatives and Hanoi's declaration of its intention to continue the conflict. It actually was the men in Hanoi who made the decision for a resumption of the bombing of military targets in North Vietnam since, if the war must continue, the effort to reduce or prevent the flow of men and supplies into South Vietnam from North Vietnam must continue.

President Johnson took obvious military risks when he suspended the bombings for more than a month. He felt that these were outweighed by other considerations, and he was correct in doing what he did. At the same time, the military situation imposed definite limitations upon how long the suspension could continue. In fact, the restraint shown by the President and American military commanders was in itself unprecedented.

It is clear the Communist leaders believe that, as was true of the French prior to 1954, the American people will become weary of this kind of war and its cost and that the war will become such a hot domestic issue in this country that President Johnson or a successor in the White House will be forced to surrender and retreat by withdrawing American forces from South Vietnam.

A report that the Communist leaders have decided to continue the war through the 1968 presidential election makes sense, in a situation where there is very little sense. They hope that, if they cannot force President Johnson to capitulate, they can bring about the election of another President who will.

Their appraisal of the internal American political situation, as well as that of American character, has been encouraged by the conduct of some Americans.

It is, of course, desirable that U.S. policy with respect to Vietnam be debated. This is true of all governmental policies. It is true likewise that debates of this kind actually strengthen democracy. But it also is true that people who do not understand democracy and the functioning of the American democratic system can easily be misled, and very few, if any, Communists have this understanding.

Time, we are convinced, will show the Communists that they were misled, that their appraisals and conclusions were erroneous. This is not the first time, nor is it likely to be the last, that the world has had to pay a very high price in blood, treasure, and suffering for the miscalculation of a few men who happen to have within their control the instruments of national power.

The tragedy is that all this waste, death and suffering could be avoided. It still can be avoided anytime the Communists will abandon their aggression and lust for conquest. President Johnson has made it clear that his pursuit of peace will go on, in the United Nations and elsewhere. It must, but there is not much hope for success so long as the Communists believe that the American people will win their victory for them.

The Recognition of God in Our Public and Private Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most controversial and important

issues facing the American people today is the subject of the recognition of God in our public as well as our private lives. The Supreme Court has been instrumental in secularizing our public life through its series of decisions which began with outlawing voluntary, nonsectarian prayers in public schools. Mr. Gene Rickett has published a book of poems entitled "Poems of Inspiration," which are a significant contribution toward a better public awareness of the issue which faces the American public. This book of poems was published by the Marlboro Herald-Advocate, of Bennettsville, S.C., and Mr. Rickett has been kind and generous enough to present me with an autographed copy of his book.

One particular poem bears directly on the subject of prayers in schools. I ask unanimous consent that this poem entitled "God Out Of School," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

GOD OUT OF SCHOOL
(By Gene Rickett)

The Supreme Court made a decision today
To put God out of the schools in the U.S.A.
And now the problem that we have to face,
Is what will become of the human race.

Are we better today than we were long ago
Or have we just reached an all-time low?
And "We the People" could be a lot worse
When we face the Maker of this great universe.

And these Justices, who claim they stand tall,
Who took an oath, under God, to serve us all,
And did they really have so little to rule,
Than to pick on God, to put Him out of school?

Can we send our children to an atheist school,

Where they can't even mention the Golden Rule?

Where God isn't welcome, He was even expelled!

By this decision that was straight out of hell.

Is it freedom of religion, or freedom of speech,

When the Government tells us what we cannot teach?

Is it justice, or just tribulation
And doesn't it warrant an investigation?

Dr. Frederick P. Whiddon, 1 of the 10 Outstanding Young Men in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce has, for the past 28 years, conducted an annual project in which it names 10 outstanding young men of the year.

The awards are determined by extensive study as a means of honoring some of the most capable, dedicated, and inspiring young men of the Nation. Men who have won this honor in the past include some of the most important names of our national leadership, in govern-

ment, medicine, education, space exploration, and other important fields.

One of the 10 men selected for this extraordinary honor for the year 1965 is Dr. Frederick P. Whiddon, president of the University of South Alabama located at Mobile. He is worthy of the honor.

Dr. Whiddon is 35 years old, is married, and has four children. He is a native of Henry County in Alabama. He took his undergraduate study at Birmingham Southern College, and his Ph. D. at Emory University, in 1963.

In November of 1963, he was selected to be president of the University of South Alabama, an institution which was then created: the first public institution of higher learning to be established in Alabama in nearly 70 years.

At 33, Dr. Whiddon was judged to be the youngest college president in the Nation, according to a study of 2,046 colleges and universities. But the more significant accomplishments of this young administrator over the next 18 months brought added laurels from the general public and the field of higher education.

Within that period he engaged and organized an administrative staff and faculty of 100 members, recruited an initial student body which now surpasses estimated capacity by 100 percent, developed a basic curriculum, supervised purchase of 60,000 carefully selected books for the university library, and inaugurated first classes with 274 students in the summer of 1964.

Approximately 2,000 students are enrolled at the university now, and enrollment for the next several years appears limited only by the physical facilities.

Dr. Whiddon has a rare combination of the diligence and insight of a scholar and the business acumen of a man of action. He has needed these attributes in his successful efforts to translate the ideals of visionaries into the bricks and mortar of a university.

He is one of the first State university presidents in the South to handle racial integration without incident. He early established a policy of guarantees for academic freedom, and frequently has been called upon to defend it.

This policy has been a major factor in attracting highly qualified faculty members from throughout the Nation. Located as it is in a major port city, the University of South Alabama has faculty members from Europe, Central America, and the Far East, and, with foreign students, the institution already has an international atmosphere.

President Whiddon has moved strongly ahead to establish the second medical school in the State, and \$3 million has been committed toward its development.

Dr. Whiddon financed his own education by contracting and building nine houses. When it came time to build the new university's presidential home he refused to use public funds for it, and instead, financed, designed, and built it himself.

He holds a clear concept of the significant role of education in our lives. He believes that Alabama's full potential will be realized only when thousands more of its citizens have available the opportunities for higher education.

February 9, 1966

the States of the Northwest. Idaho's entitlement to fully participate ought to be perfectly clear. The downstream dams belong fully as much to us as they do to the people of Oregon and Washington. And fully a fourth of the water turning their generators is furnished by Idaho.

So, if we're not going to shortchange ourselves, the time has come for us to seek a Columbia Basin account. Its easy enough to blame others for our failure to secure one long ago. But the truth is that we haven't gotten together to work for one, and the blame is ours. Still, I think the time is ripe and the opportunity exists in Congress. Accordingly, the legislation I shall introduce in the upcoming session of Congress to authorize the southwest Idaho water development project will contain the necessary "breakthrough language," and I hope that both Senator Jordan and I will have the united support of Idaho in our attempt to achieve this breakthrough in the months ahead. It means a great deal. Without it, as I have said, the full development of our water resources in southern Idaho can never be achieved.

Well, I also want to talk about the farmer in a larger context this evening. I don't know whether you folks have heard the story about the Texas rancher who came to visit an Idaho potato farmer. One morning the rancher stepped out onto the porch of the farmer's house. He looked to the right and he saw the fence line nearby. He looked off to the left and, down a little piece, he saw the other fence line. So, he turned to his Idaho friend and said, "You ought to see that Texas ranch of mine. Why, I get up early in the morning, get into my car, and start to drive from one of my fence lines toward the other. I drive and I drive and I drive, and late in the afternoon, when the sun is beginning to set, I finally reach the other fence line." "You know," replied the Idaho farmer, "I used to have a car like that myself."

I wish I had as ready an answer for the big question which continues to perplex all of us concerning the American farmer and his future. I don't possess a crystal ball. I can't give you a certain forecast of things to come. But I can tell you, on the basis of signs in Washington and obvious developing facts abroad, that I strongly sense that the role of the American farmer is going to change; that instead of expensive farm programs to cut back on the production, we're very likely to find the American farmer soon enlisted in a national effort to produce more instead of less.

Why do I say this? Not because our national food consumption is going to expand enough to change things for the farmer, but because of the world situation. The fact of the matter is that we are faced today with the specter of spreading starvation in the world. Half the world's people are suffering from a chronic insufficiency of food, with every likelihood that their plight will worsen. Only 3.5 percent of the earth's surface is arable, and most of that is already under cultivation. But world population, which took 100,000 years to reach 3 billion, will double in size in the next 35 years.

I just returned from Rio de Janeiro, where I went with Secretary of State Dean Rusk to attend the Hemispheric Conference of the American Republics. In Latin America, 35 years ago, they were exporting grain. Today, Latin America imports far more grain than it exports. There is insufficient food being produced to feed its present population of some 250 million people. Yet, between now and the end of the century, the population will increase to over 600 million.

In India, in the next 15 years, 200 million people will be added, a larger number than the present population of the United States. Inevitably, the world's demand for food is going to soar, in the years immediately ahead.

In the face of this prospect, there is a

growing feeling in Washington that we cannot keep on paying farmers for not producing when spreading starvation stalks the world. So it is that food, in my judgment, will soon become our most precious weapon for peace. Better that we unleash our farmers; that we declare all all-out war against hunger for the balance of this century, than suffer the consequences that spreading starvation will bring.

This means that we should not only come to share more fully in the commercial food markets of the world, but that we must expand upon our food-for-peace program, in Africa, Asia and in Latin America, where the best efforts to produce more food will fall short of meeting critical needs.

Now, it must be recognized that deliberately producing farm commodities for use overseas represents a departure from past policy. Present food-for-peace efforts are based largely on the distribution of surpluses that have accumulated in spite of farm programs to prevent them. It must also be recognized that in most cases it is preferable, if not essential, for developing countries to supply most of their own food needs. But the fact remains that for the foreseeable future, these countries cannot increase their production fast enough to meet their needs without food shipments from the United States.

The question is, Will we, at enormous public expense, continue to support farm programs designed to cut back on production, while mounting hunger spreads across the world? I don't think we will. Morally, I don't think we can. It is impossible to justify subsidies to cut back production when the money could be better spent to protect the producing farmer through export subsidies, especially when the food we send abroad is the best weapon we have for peace and stability.

I serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where I try to work for sensible foreign aid programs. I have become convinced that, of all the different kinds of aid we give, the food is the best. Much of the money we are spending on other projects is often wasted. It may well be that the American farmer is destined to become the most important single contributor to American foreign policy.

The second and more fundamental front in the war against hunger is the urgent need for a rapid acceleration of food production abroad. We and other advanced countries must assist the developing world to undertake the kind of agricultural revolution which we have experienced in the last hundred years.

There is an urgent need for the knowledge and skills of our agricultural technicians, research scientists, extension workers, and experienced farmers. An American Farmers Corps consisting of retired farmers or working farmers willing to take leave of their own farms for a time could perform an invaluable service abroad. There is great need, too, for more fertilizer, pesticides, irrigation development, hybrid seed and feed-mixing equipment. Enlightened land ownership and tax policies, improved distribution systems, and low-cost credit are essential to rural development. So is an improved system of rural education.

This type of aid is not inexpensive nor is it easy to implement. But food and agricultural assistance are less expensive than military hardware and they are much more constructive and helpful to the peoples we assist. As one watched our two impoverished friends, India and Pakistan, shooting at each other with American arms, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that both countries need our food and our farm know-how more than they need our guns.

Furthermore, the strengthening of the diets and the agricultural economy of the developing countries—far from removing them as potential American markets—would

open the way for new long-range U.S. markets. Those nations with advancing agricultural and industrial productivity are also our best commercial customers. Canada with a tiny fraction of the population of India is a larger American customer than India. After assisting postwar Japan develop its agricultural and industrial economy, we discovered that she has become the largest purchaser of American farm produce.

Communist China has called for a "people's war" in Asia, Africa, and Latin America to win the world over to communism. But Red China has failed on the agricultural front and the situation has been worsened by drought and other natural hazards. She cannot win a "people's war" against the developed world if we will place the welfare of people above short-term goals of military maneuvering and cold war strategy. So let us take the lead in a "people's war" with corn instead of cannon, with farmers instead of marines, with agricultural technology instead of battle plans, with food instead of fear.

The future of the American farmer is big—not bleak. Then, let us begin to build big again for the future of Idaho's farmer. Let our plans match the dimensions of our rivers and our deserts. Let us move ahead, no longer the prisoners of pessimism, but as pioneers once more with promises to keep.

If we will do that, our grandchildren, long after we are dead and gone, will remember us in their prayers.

Hanoi's Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, "we will not grow tired." The President has repeatedly said this, but it is a fact which unfortunately has not penetrated into the thinking of Hanoi.

This is the reason for Hanoi's completely negative response to peace offers.

There some leaders expect that we may win their war for them. The war for them would be won if the United States should tire and give up the fight against aggression.

This point is made abundantly clear by the Houston Post which states that:

Communist leaders are counting heavily on the American people and their political leaders to win the war in Vietnam for them.

Actually, says the Post:

It was the men in Hanoi who made the decision for a resumption of the bombing of military targets in North Vietnam since, if the war must continue, the effort to reduce or prevent the flow of men and supplies into South Vietnam from North Vietnam must continue.

The tragedy over there can be stopped "anytime the Communists will abandon their aggression and lust for conquest." Because many concerned Americans will want to ponder the wisdom of this article, I think it should be printed in the Record, and with permission of my colleagues this will be done:

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 1, 1966]

BOMBING DECISION MADE IN HANOI

Communist leaders in Hanoi, and presumably in Peiping and Moscow as well, are counting heavily on the American people and

should be restored to such condition, in order to promote sound water conservation, and promote the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

Sec. 3. (a) The following rivers, or segments thereof, and related, adjacent lands, most of which are public lands, as depicted on maps numbered "NWR-SAL-1001, NWR-CLE-1001, NWR-ROG-1001, NWR-RIO-1000, NWR-ELE-1000, NWR-CAP-1000, and NWR-SHE-1000" are hereby designated as "wild river areas":

(1) Salmon, Idaho—the Salmon from town of North Fork downstream to its confluence with the Snake River and the entire Middle Fork.

(2) Clearwater, Middle Fork, Idaho—the Middle Fork from the town of Kooskia upstream to the town of Lowell; the Lochsa River from its junction with the Selway at Lowell forming the Middle Fork, upstream to the Powell Ranger Station; and the Selway River from Lowell upstream to its origin.

(3) Rogue, Oregon—the segment extending from the Applegate River to the Route 101 highway bridge above Gold Beach.

(4) Rio Grande, New Mexico—the segment extending from the Colorado State line downstream to near the town of Pilar, and the lower four miles of the Red River.

(5) Eleven Point, Missouri—the segment of the river extending from a point near Greer Spring downstream to State Highway 142.

(6) Cacapon, West Virginia—entire river and its tributary, the Lost River.

(7) Shenandoah, West Virginia—the segment of the river located in the State of West Virginia.

Said maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

FEDERAL-STATE PLANNING FOR ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture where national forest lands are involved, after consultation with interested Federal agencies, are directed to consult with the Governors and officials of the States in which the rivers listed below are located to ascertain whether a joint Federal-State plan is feasible and desirable in the public interest to conserve segments of these rivers. They shall submit to the President their recommendations for inclusion of any or all of them in the National Wild Rivers System, and the President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate:

(1) Buffalo, Tennessee—the entire river from its beginning in Lawrence County to its confluence with the Duck River.

(2) Green, Wyoming—the segment extending from its origin in the Bridger Wilderness Area, south to its confluence with Horse Creek.

(3) Hudson, New York—the segment of the mainstem extending from its origin in the Adirondack Park downstream to the vicinity of the town of Luzerne; Boreas River from its mouth to Durgin Brook; Indian River from its mouth to Abanakee Dam; and Cedar River from its mouth to Cedar River flow.

(4) Missouri, Montana—the segment upstream from Fort Peck Reservoir toward the town of Fort Benton.

(5) Niobrara, Nebraska—the mainstem segment lying between the confluence of Antelope Creek downstream to the headwaters of the proposed Norden Reservoir east of the town of Valentine, and the lower eight miles of its Snake River tributary.

(6) Skagit, Washington—the Skagit from the town of Mount Vernon upstream to Gorge powerhouse near the town of New-

halem; the Cascade River from its mouth to the confluence of the North and South Forks; the Sauk from its mouth to Elliott Creek; and the Sulattle from its mouth to Milk Creek.

(7) Susquehanna, New York and Pennsylvania—the segment of the Susquehanna River from a dam at Cooperstown, New York, downstream to the town of Pittston, Pennsylvania.

(8) Wolf, Wisconsin—the segment reaching from the confluence of the Hunting River downstream to the town of Keshena.

(9) Suwannee, Georgia and Florida—entire river from its source in the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia to the gulf, and the outlying Ichetucknee Springs, Florida.

(10) Youghiogheny, Maryland and Pennsylvania—from Oakland, Maryland, to the Youghiogheny Reservoir, and from the Youghiogheny Dam, downstream to the town of Connellsville, Pennsylvania.

(11) Little Miami, Ohio—the segment of the Little Miami River in Clark, Greene, Warren, and Clermont Counties from a point in the vicinity of Clifton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of Morrow, Ohio.

(12) Little Beaver, Ohio—the segment of the North and Middle Forks of the Little Beaver River, in Columbiana County, from a point in the vicinity of Negly and Elkton, Ohio, downstream to a point in the vicinity of East Liverpool, Ohio.

(13) Pine Creek, Pennsylvania—the segment from Ansonia, Pennsylvania, to Waterville, Pennsylvania.

(14) Delaware, Pennsylvania and New York—the segment from Hancock, New York, to Matamoras, Pennsylvania.

(15) Allegheny, Pennsylvania—the segment from the Allegheny Reservoir at Kinzua, Pennsylvania, to Tionesta, Pennsylvania, and then from Franklin, Pennsylvania, to East Brady, Pennsylvania.

(16) Clarion, Pennsylvania—the segment from where it enters the Allegheny River to Ridgway, Pennsylvania.

(17) West Branch Susquehanna, Pennsylvania—the segment of the West Branch Susquehanna from Clearfield, Pennsylvania, to Lock Haven, Pennsylvania.

RIVER BASIN PLANNING FOR ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(c) In all planning for the use and development of water and related land resources, consideration shall be given by all Federal agencies involved to potential wild river areas, and all river basin and project plan reports submitted to the Congress shall discuss any such potentials. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make specific studies and investigations to determine which additional wild river areas within the United States shall be evaluated in planning reports by all Federal agencies as potential alternative uses of the water and related land resources involved.

OTHER ADDITIONS TO SYSTEM

(d) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall also submit to the President from time to time their recommendations for inclusion in the National Wild Rivers System of any other river or segment thereof. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations for such legislation as he deems appropriate.

(e) Recommendations made under this section shall be developed in consultation with the States, those Federal agencies which normally participate in the development of recreation plans and comprehensive river basin plans, any commissions established pursuant to interstate compacts the assigned responsibilities of which would be affected, and commissions or other bodies which may be established for the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan for the river basin within which the contemplated wild river area would be located. Each such recom-

mendation shall be accompanied by (1) expressions of any views which the agencies and States consulted pursuant to the foregoing may submit within ninety days after having been notified of the proposed recommendation, (2) a statement setting forth the probable effect of the recommended action on any comprehensive river basin plan that may have been adopted by Congress or that is serving as a guide for coordinating Federal or Federal and State programs in the basin, and (3) in the absence of such plan, a statement indicating the probable effect of the recommended action on alternative beneficial uses of the resources of the basin.

(f) Whenever it is proposed to add a river or segment thereof to the National Wild Rivers System, and the river or segment runs through non-Federal land, recommendations with respect to its addition and with respect to whether it should be wholly or partly acquired, protected, and managed pursuant to exclusive State authority shall be made to the President by the Governor of each State concerned. Such recommendation to the President shall be accompanied by or based upon a general State plan which assures the effectuation of the purposes of this Act in perpetuity. The President shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the designation of such river or segment thereof as a part of the National Wild Rivers System and the administration of such area by State authority, together with such draft legislation that he deems appropriate.

NEED FOR LAND ACQUISITION

(g) Any recommendation for an addition to the National Wild Rivers System shall indicate the extent to which land will need to be acquired by the State and by the Federal Government, and the extent to which the acquisition of scenic easements or other interests in land may be an adequate substitute for the acquisition of a fee title.

ADMINISTRATION OF SYSTEM

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the wild river area designated by subsection 3(a), paragraph (4) and the Secretary of Agriculture shall administer the areas designated by paragraphs (2) and (5). The area designated by paragraphs (1), (3), (6), and (7) shall be administered in a manner agreed upon by the two Secretaries, or as directed by the President.

(b) Wild river areas designated by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, except that when the wild river area is wholly within, partly within, or closely adjacent to, a national forest such area shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture unless it is also partly within, or closely adjacent to, an area administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in which event the wild river area shall be administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, or as directed by the President. The Secretary charged with the administration of a wild river area or portion thereof designated by this Act or by subsequent Acts may agree with the Governor of the State for State or local governmental agency participation in the administration of the area. The States shall be encouraged to cooperate in the planning and administration of such wild river areas where they include State-owned or county-owned lands. Any Federal land located within a wild river area may, with the consent of the head of the agency having jurisdiction thereof, be transferred to the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary or State for administration as part of the wild river area. Any land transferred hereunder to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as part of a wild river area in connection with the National Forest System shall become national forest land.

February 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2687

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence is another reminder of the tactics and policies of the Soviets against the peoples of the world who love freedom and independence.

It was in 1918 that these 40 million residents of the rich Ukraine moved toward self-government after the collapse of the Russian empire. But the Bolsheviks with a Russian army invaded the new nation, set up their puppet government and the territory went under the control of the Communist dictators.

The familiar story of oppression and pillage followed. The resources of 250,000 square miles of fertile land, the mines and industry were diverted to the upbuilding of Communist power.

Resistance was bitter and very costly. Massacre and famine followed. Millions were uprooted, sent to Siberia, to other Asiatic areas to face a bitter existence as slave laborers.

And while we hear this talk of co-existence, let us remember the pattern of conquest, the ruin of peoples and of nations that have come under the Kremains fist.

In the United States today we have many Ukrainians who escaped the Communists. They have taken a place in their adopted country, are leaders in professions, citizens of the finest type. It is this group, with a full realization of the benefits of liberty, that are the voice of the 40 million behind the Iron Curtain that help keep us conscious of the dangers of communism in our country.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the Free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be impregnable.

CENTRAL FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE BLOOD DONORS SUPPORT UNITED STATES TROOPS IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress an incident which recently occurred in the district which I represent.

It is a refreshing contrast to the stories we read of the draft card burnings, and so forth.

These young people are serving just as the men overseas are serving.

The following story was provided me by Mr. R. N. "Bert" Dosh, editor emeritus of the Ocala, Fla., Star-Banner:

One hundred persons donated a pint of blood each at Central Florida Junior College located at Ocala in mid-December in support of United States troops in Vietnam.

The CFJC campus was the site of the "bleed-in" sponsored by the Central Florida College Civitan Club. Community residents as well as CFJC students, faculty, and staff were invited to participate in the blood donation program, according to Lester R. Goldman, director of student activities and collegiate Civitan sponsor.

The blood was drawn by the mid-Florida Red Cross program with headquarters in Daytona Beach.

Because whole blood will keep only 21 days, the blood drawn at CFJC was sent to the Squibb laboratories in New Brunswick, N.J., to be fractionated and subsequently sent to the U.S. Department of Defense for stockpiling for use by U.S. troops as needed.

A number of organizations contributed to the "bleed-in" in various ways, including the Marion County Medical Association, Munroe Memorial Hospital, the Ocala Junior Woman's Club, the Marion County Chapter of the American Red Cross, the CFJC Department of Nursing Education, Libby, McNeill & Libby, Nehl Bottling Works, Public Market, and many individuals.

The list of those who contributed follows:
Kerr, William R., Ocala; McKenney, Carl O., Ocala; Barthlow, Arthur P., Ocala; Reames, Joe M., Gainesville; Ritterhoff, Dorothy A., Ocala; Miller, Mark S., Ocala; Hesea, Thomas R., Inverness; Childress, Joe B., Citra; Greene, John M., Ocala; Maguire, Glen, Groveland; Herrin, William, Ocala; Blake, Timothy M., Ocala; Thomas, William J., Ocala; Branan, William V., Ocala; Cramer, John L., Anthony; Bryant, Robert C., Ocala; Brodbent, Albert S., Ocala; Miller, Curtis R., Gainesville; Aubrey, Ray H., Jr., Ocala; Glanzer, Charles M., Ocala; White, Benny C., Sparr; Denson, Jay T., Ocala; Brasington, John A., Ocala; Rittenhoff, Robert F., Ocala; Hart, Michael L., Oklawaha; Murphy, Arvid R., Ocala; McCown, Bruce L., Umastilla.

Richerton, Darrell, Ocala; Rou, Judy, Reddick; Michelle, Georgini, Oxford; Jaffe, Dennis J., Orlando; Dore, Edward J., Orlando; Johnston, Jane, Gainesville; Waters, Robert A., Ocala; Wood, Lana Sue, Ocala; Cowart, Gayle, Mascotte; Miller, Kenneth D., Ocala; Stockdale, Irving, Ocala; Steele, William R., Ocala; Woods, Carolyn J., Ocala; Friel, Billie, Ocala; Purvis, Sydney R., Jacksonville; Balasch, Paul J., Inverness; Kepple, Sharon K., Ocala; Fordyce, Joseph, Ocala; Collum, Donna, Ocala; Bowser, Linda, Summerfield; Futch, John E., Ocala; Stein, Roger A., Jacksonville; DeVore, Henry F., Reddick; Conrad, Craig H., Ocala; Mazourek, Alvin, Brooksville; Simonds, Edward P., Jr., Perry, Eva S., Oklawaha.

Carter, Thomas P., Chiefland; Aliff, James H., Ocala; Branswig, Norman L., Ocala; Johnson, John J., Inverness; Fennell, George A., Ocala; Ritch, John C., Gainesville; Lynn, Wade, Ocala; Baker, Pat, Hawthorne; Curtis, Wayne, Ocala; Drummond, Arch John, Gainesville; Porter, Kenneth, Gainesville; Pfeifer, Michael, Newberry; Beasley, Elsa, Trenton; Sniper, Thomas G., Ocala; Gattrell, Donna, Reddick; Bass, Robert, Ocala; Hancock, Anthony R., Ocala; Barber, W. B., Ocala; Russell, Dale, Ocala; Barnett, J. R. III, Fort Meade; Schnessler, Diana, Ocala; Garrar, David, Greenfield, Ind.; Neil, Ronald, Ocala.

Ameri, Booshang, Ocala; Gray, Jeanette L., Ocala; Peebles, Jack G., Dunnellon; Treacy, Stephen, Lecanto; Turek, Richard W., Belleview; Prime, Kermit, Cross City; Bridges, Robert T., Ocala; Corliss, Lawrence, Ocala; Kobbins, George W., Ocala; Herndon, Bettie M., Oklawaha; Stephens, Stanley E., Dunnellon; Packard, Philip Bruce, Gainesville; Russ, Robert, Wildwood; Beshiri, Gerald A., Ocala; Brennan, John Jr., Brooklyn, N.Y.; Witter, Pam, Ocala; Ohlinger, Fred, Ocala; McClellan, Byron D., Ocala; Stone, Dottie, Ocala; Stephens, Charles, Ocala; Birch, Richard, Ocala; Crenshaw, Mary A., Summerfield.

INTRODUCTION OF WILD RIVERS BILL

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

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the preservation of rivers in their natural state, along with the adjacent land areas, is an undertaking of utmost importance not only to today's generation but for the enjoyment of the Americans who will be here after we are gone.

I am introducing a wild rivers bill today identical to the first bill to pass the Senate in this session of the Congress.

This bill establishes two basic wild river categories for the immediate future. In the first category, 7 rivers are designated immediately as wild rivers, and in the second category, 17 rivers are specified as meriting study as to whether they should be brought into the Wild Rivers System.

In both categories, rivers are included which are of importance to the people of Maryland and Metropolitan Washington. Included for immediate designation as wild rivers are the Cacapon and Shenandoah in West Virginia. Designated for consideration for future incorporation are rivers in Pennsylvania, along with Maryland's Youghiogheny River in Garrett County.

These rivers, as part of our original landscape, comprise part of our American heritage which we should protect for posterity, and I hope the Wild Rivers System will be established by the 89th Congress.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wild Rivers Act".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2 (a) The Congress finds that some of the free-flowing rivers of the United States possess unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values of present and potential benefit to the American people. The Congress also finds that our established national policy of dam and other construction at appropriate sections of the rivers of the United States needs to be complemented by a policy that would preserve other selected rivers or sections thereof in their free-flowing condition to protect the water quality of such rivers and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes. It is the policy of Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all of the American people selected parts of the Nation's diminishing resource of free-flowing rivers. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wild Rivers System to be composed of the areas that are designated as "wild river areas" in this Act, and the additional areas that may be designated in subsequent Acts of Congress. Areas designated as "wild river areas" by subsequent Acts of Congress shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act unless the subsequent Acts provide otherwise.

DEFINITION OF WILD RIVER AREA

(b) A wild river area eligible to be included in the System is a stream or section of a stream, tributary, or river—and the related adjacent land area—that should be left in its free-flowing condition, or that

cult a time our retired citizens have in making ends meet, even with the benefit of such "privileges."

I was appalled then, to read in the Wall Street Journal article where the Michigan Board of Pharmacy has put a stop to the practice of offering a special drug discount to senior citizens on the grounds that it "discriminates" against younger people.

The executive secretary of the Michigan Board of Pharmacy, a Mr. Allen Weatherwax, is quoted as saying:

Old people can get free drugs through welfare and old-age assistance.

What an incredibly calloused remark.

Certainly it deserves to be ranked with the infamous retort of Marie Antoinette, who when told the people of France were crying for bread snapped: "Let them eat cake."

Because, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Weatherwax was asked to let this drug discount plan for senior citizens continue—so that they could meet their medical needs with dignity and independence from their own meager resources at no cost to the State—his response was: "Let them go on welfare."

This way, of course, they could get drugs but only after putting on their begging clothes and being stamped with the welfare stigma.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Wall Street Journal article to which I refer be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

THE PRIVILEGED CLASS: STORES, GOVERNMENTS GIVE BREAKS TO ELDERLY—SHOPS SAY PLANS OFTEN LEAD TO NEW ORDERS FROM YOUNG; DRUG FIRM RUNS INTO TROUBLE

(By Jerry Flint)

DETROIT.—Want to know how to get a discount on your taxes, a free checking account, a cheap fishing license, a cut rate on medicine, a half-price ticket to the ball game?

Here's how: Grow old.

It seems that nearly everybody is trying to help out the old folks these days. But it's not all as altruistic as it looks. "Many oldsters have children, and their children have children. The youngsters are very grateful for what we can do for their parents, and this leads to new business," says Charles Rosen, executive vice president of Revco Drug Stores, Inc., a big Midwest chain that gives people over age 60 a 10-percent discount on prescription drug prices.

And Marvin Criger, senior vice president of the bank of Dearborn, Mich., says the bank provides free checking accounts to older people because it wants to help them out. But he adds: "Their children are grown and live in this area, too. If we do something nice for the old folks, it's likely they'll say something nice about us to their children." He figures the free accounts cost the bank about \$1,000 a month.

A TAX BREAK

Whatever the reason, the number of privileges for this privileged class is definitely on the rise. In Michigan, the legislature last year enacted a law giving most homeowners over 65 a special discount on local home property taxes; the plan is expected to save the eligible homeowners an average of \$90 a year.

Delaware recently passed a property tax exemption for elderly homeowners earning \$3,000 a year or less. And Michigan cut the price of fishing licenses for oldsters to 50 cents from \$2, effective last month, and plans free dental service for the elderly.

In the Los Angeles area, people over 65 get special rates for Dodger and Angel baseball games, movies and other entertainment, and cut rates on drugs and discounts from some neighborhood grocery and furniture stores. Los Angeles County even has a department of senior citizens' affairs, which encourages old people "to go in (to stores) and ask for special benefits," says John Walker, assistant director of the agency.

The over-65 crowd—which soon will be getting Government-financed medical care along with its other benefits—is happy with the increasing discounts and would like to see more. "Senior citizens should have free hunting, fishing, and trapping licenses," says Julius Johnson, 72, a retired Ford Motor Co. worker in Detroit. Gordon Brocklebank, 69, a former warehouseman, says he would "like to see the 4-percent sales tax taken off food for us."

LIVING CLOSE TO THE LINE

One reason many oldsters want more benefits is that they say they can barely get along on the money they have. Says Julius Johnson's wife: "You have to live too close to the line. Groceries have gone up so high. You can't make a little money go a long way anymore." Harry Riflin, 77, a retired tailor here, agrees. "Those discounts are a good idea," he says. "Older people can't live on what they get. Take off rent and medical insurance and there's not much left."

The plans for the elderly definitely have brought in new business from their younger friends and relatives, say banks and the Revco drugstore chain, but they concede they can't accurately measure the impact. The manager of a Detroit bowling alley says a special price for older people—three lines for \$1 instead of the usual 50 cents a line—has boosted business to as many as 200 oldsters an afternoon from 20 to 25 before the plan was started.

Businessmen don't always respond, of course, to pleas by older people for special discounts. In Detroit, letters by oldsters to newspapers recently asked for special rates for haircuts, but barbers apparently are deaf to the demand. In Lansing, Mich., a plea for cutrate taxi charges also has failed.

When special rates are introduced there generally is little opposition, although Reyco has run into some from Michigan's Board of Pharmacy, which figures the plan "discriminates" against younger people. The board forced Revco to stop enrolling old persons in the discount plan in Michigan, although it allowed the company to continue the discounts for those already signed up.

"Old people can get free drugs through welfare and old-age assistance," says Allan Weatherwax, 59-year-old executive secretary of the pharmacy board. And he adds: "Young people may need more help than old folks." Noting that the State itself has legislated some special discounts for older persons, Mr. Weatherwax comments: "There is a difference between what is right and what is politically motivated."

WHY FIGHT IN VIETNAM?

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

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 8, the Washington Evening Star published an editorial, entitled "Why Fight in Vietnam."

It is in the belief that there can never be too much clarification or reiteration of this position that I call to the attention of my colleagues this fine interpretation.

Besieged by critics from all sides who often propose simple solutions, the President has once again defined our Nation's commitment to peace in the world. A lesser man would not have the courage to steadfastly maintain this difficult and complex posture in what is a disagreeable, distasteful situation.

By his example we must all realize there are no easy, painless solutions. We must also realize the alternatives are clear cut. As the President stated in his remarks upon arriving in Honolulu:

If we allow the Communists to win in Vietnam * * * we will have to fight again someplace else.

Mr. Speaker, since this is a matter of utmost concern to us all I insert it in the RECORD where it can be given careful study by my colleagues:

WHY FIGHT IN VIETNAM?

Once again the President has tried to answer those among his critics who say they do not understand why the United States is fighting in Vietnam.

The critics will not be satisfied with the answer. For there is nothing new in it. But it is hard to know what more the President might have said in his remarks upon arriving in Honolulu.

In substance, this is what he had to say: We are fighting to determine whether aggression and terror are the way of the future—a question of the gravest importance to all other nations, large or small, who seek to walk in peace and independence. If the Communists win in Vietnam they will know they can accomplish through so-called wars of liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea—or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey—or in a free election anywhere.

At this point, Mr. Johnson, in perhaps the most significant phase of his remarks, decided to lock horns with his senatorial critics, especially those in his own party. "There are special pleaders," he said, "who counsel retreat in Vietnam. They belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope. We cannot accept their logic that tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us—or that subjugation by an armed minority in Asia is different from subjugation by an armed minority in Europe. Were we to follow their course, how many nations might fall before the aggressor? Where would our treaties be respected, our word honored, our commitment believed. * * * If we allow the Communists to win in Vietnam * * * we will have to fight again someplace else—at what cost no one knows. That is why it is vitally important to every American family that we stop the Communists in South Vietnam."

It could not have been easy for a consensus man to say these things. He knows his explanation will neither satisfy nor silence his critics. But there it is. The President has taken his stand and it will be difficult if not impossible for him to turn back. Nor is it at all likely, the critics notwithstanding, that Mr. Johnson intends to turn back if he thinks he has the support of the American people, to whom his comments were really addressed.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

February 9, 1966

California. In submitting this legislation to the House, I want to emphasize the importance of size and location, in establishing a true Redwoods Park.

Anyone who has been fortunate enough to stand for a moment among the tall and majestic redwoods of California and see the light rays filter down between the trees can only support legislation to create a Redwoods National Park to sustain this sight for an urban America which increasingly flees to such natural areas for relaxation and regeneration.

But this is accepted—the need to conserve our forests and rivers and sights has not been a debatable proposition since the days of our esteemed and energetic President Theodore Roosevelt. The question of conflict revolves instead around whether we are to preserve the best of what we have.

This bill proposes that a redwood park be established along Prairie and Redwood Creeks in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties. This site is far superior to others which have been suggested. First because it includes the largest remaining concentration of virgin redwoods with both major groves and record trees. Over half of the 90,000 acres proposed is virgin growth. This is significant as we realize that only 200,000 acres are left of the original 2 million.

This area would provide a balanced park with diversified recreational opportunities—18 miles of coastline and 22 miles of Redwood Creek, valleys and forests. It is recommended by the National Geographic Society, the major conservation organizations and a year ago was the first choice of the national park Service.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will recognize the very great benefits of this bill which will establish a National Park in a region which still boasts of the beauty and naturalness which we are attempting to preserve. I urge my colleagues' support of H.R. 12711.

NOTIFYING THE NEXT OF KIN

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

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter and a copy of an editorial from Howard White, a constituent of the Sixth Congressional District of North Carolina, and editor of the Burlington, N.C., Daily-Times News.

Mr. White's letter and editorial pointed to a situation which concerns me very deeply. He criticized a procedure followed by the Department of Defense in notifying next of kin of the death of a serviceman.

In his editorial, Mr. White described how a bereaved mother was notified of the death of her son. A commercial taxi driver drove to her home at night and calmly and impersonally handed her a telegram which contained the shocking news that her son had been killed.

I am writing to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara to suggest, as does Mr. White, that there must be a better way

to inform the next of kin that their loved ones are dead.

We owe those who have made the great sacrifice of a son or husband more than this. They deserve more respect than this cold knock on the door by a cabbie. They have given their most precious possession to their country. Can their country not give them the respect, the understanding and compassion they deserve?

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will agree with Mr. White. There must be a better way.

For the benefit of my colleagues, who I know will be as concerned as I am in this matter, I would like to include in my remarks a copy of a letter I am dispatching to Secretary McNamara, as well as copies of Mr. White's letter and editorial:

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

HON. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to call your attention to a situation which concerns me deeply, as I know it will you.

I recently received a letter from Mr. Howard White, editor of the Daily Times-News in Burlington, N.C., along with a clipping from the editorial page of his newspaper. (Copies of Mr. White's letter and accompanying editorial are attached herewith.)

Mr. White, in his letter and in his editorial, asks the very timely and cogent question: Is there not "a better way" to notify next of kin of the death of a serviceman?

I am hopeful that the procedure outlined in the Times-News editorial is an isolated instance and not generally used to notify a mother of the death of her son—or daughter. The thought of an impersonal taxi driver coldly delivering a death message to the home of the next of kin of an American serviceman is a chilling one to me.

I would not be so bold as to outline a better solution, for you and your subordinates are much better equipped to prescribe more suitable approaches to the problem than I am. I would only repeat Mr. White's plea for a "better way." There must be a better way to inform a mother or a wife of the most stunning and tragic news she can ever receive—that her son or husband has been killed. We owe them more than that since they have made the great sacrifice of their loved one for his country. There has to be a "better way," one which entails the compassion, the humaneness, and understanding which the recipient of this woeful news deserves.

After you have read Mr. White's editorial, I am sure that you will agree with both of us. There must be a "better way." And, with the increasing bitterness of the struggle in Vietnam, this matter becomes more important with every fatality occurring there.

Knowing of the many and heavy burdens that are yours now, I would be doubly appreciative of your consideration of this matter.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HORACE R. KORNEGAY.

THE DAILY TIMES-NEWS,
Burlington, N.C., February 5, 1966.

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HORACE: We ran into this situation again on procedure in notifying the next of kin.

I'm enclosing an editorial I had on yesterday's page.

It simply seems to me that there is a better way to handle this.

A knock on the door, a mother by herself in the house, a telegram, her son is dead. I'm sure that across the Nation there are many mothers who have been in danger themselves through such a practice, for all would not be without some degree of shock, and so forth.

This is a suggestion, for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A. HOWARD WHITE.

[From the Burlington (N. C.) Daily Times-News, Feb. 4, 1966]

NOTIFYING THE NEXT OF KIN

The procedure of parents or next of kin being informed when a husband or son is killed while serving his country has not been changed.

But each time a telegram is delivered with such a message, there comes a big question. The conclusion which always comes is that it should be changed.

Western Union has followed a policy for several years, in agreement with the Department of Defense, that it delivers such messages. The simple requirement is that the telegram be delivered by a bonified delivery service. A taxi that has insurance is an example of a qualifying service.

When the parents of Pfc. Hiram D. Strickland of Route 2, Graham, learned of his death by telegram Wednesday night, it was by telegram delivered by a taxi driver.

There must be some better way.

Isn't it possible, we can ask, that the Chaplain's Corps at Fort Bragg be given the message, and a chaplain, in turn be the one to knock at the door and reveal the news?

If that were not possible, could not the commander of our National Guard, or the head of our reserve unit, be responsible for such a service?

There are many possible approaches to making the notification adjust closer into the Nation's respect for its men in uniform, for those who pay the supreme sacrifice, than the highly impersonal use of a telegram delivered by a commercial service. There is something missing in this link of national respect and the family suffering a loss when there is merely a knock on the door, delivery of a telegram, and departure.

There could be problems in handling the notification in some other way.

But they cannot be larger than the problem created in the hearts and minds of people within a family, or neighbors and friends, on a Nation accepting such a loss in such a routine, matter-of-fact way.

THE PRIVILEGED CLASS: STORES, GOVERNMENTS GIVE BREAKS TO THE ELDERLY

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

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 28, the Wall Street Journal published a front-page article headlined "The Privileged Class: Stores, Governments Give Breaks to the Elderly."

The article described certain discounts being made available to Michigan's senior citizens including reduced fees for fishing licenses, half-price tickets to ball games, cutrate prices for bowling, lower property taxes on their homes, and special discounts, offered by some firms, for drugs and medicines.

Let me say right here that I am heartily in accord with such practices. Statistics on incomes, pensions, and so forth, illustrate only too graphically how diffi-

terrelated and interdependent purposes.

The proposal to impose user charges or tolls on waterways could upset the delicate relationships and possibly cause irreparable damage to an important segment of the Nation's transportation system which handles over 10 percent of all of the country's freight and upon which a sizable portion of its population depends for a regulator of transportation costs.

The administration is again proposing to initiate toll charges in the form of a tax of 2 cents per gallon on fuel used by shallow draft commercial vessels.

Tom Adams asserts that such a tax or toll on the waterways would not serve the best interests of the general public or the Nation. He holds they would raise water freight charges, thus reducing traffic, and affecting other aspects of water resource development; such as, flood control and water supply. This would result in reducing the economic benefits. The future of many areas in the Nation which are heavily dependent upon these waterways could be jeopardized. This is most particularly true in the large areas served by the 22,000 miles of inland and intra-coastal waterways but would affect to some degree the whole country.

Tom Adams is well qualified to speak on the subject. He has been a farmer, thus a user of waterways; served magnificently in the State senate where he was chosen as the outstanding freshman senator in 1957, and most valuable member of the 1959 session of the legislature.

His long and sustained interest in and study of water resource development was climaxed in 1959 when he was appointed to the U.S. Commission, Southeast River Basins. Upon becoming secretary of state of Florida in 1961 he was named the most effective State administrator.

Tom Adams was active in the organization of the National Waterways Conference, Inc. in 1960. This is composed of members of the Nation's basic industries—oil, chemical, iron and steel and grain companies who use waterways of public industrial development agencies, port authorities and other local government bodies; of water carriers and waterway service industries. All are essential cogs in the economic machinery of our Nation and their welfare, development and prosperity is basic to that of the Nation at large.

The address made by Tom Adams, one which I strongly recommend to you, is a very cogent and purposeful delineation of the problem and its solution by one eminently qualified to do so.

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

[Mr. WOLFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURE FAILS TO GET A FAIR AND EQUITABLE SHARE OF THE NEW BUDGET

(Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permis-

sion to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, somewhere along the line those who formulated the budget have gotten their signals crossed.

On the one hand there are White House proposals for more effective educational programs. On the other a reduction is proposed in the school milk program fund. How, by any stretch of the imagination, can it be presumed that hungry youngsters can learn at a normal rate.

On the one hand there are predictions that our rural areas will soon be required to produce at an expanded rate to meet the growing food needs of the world. On the other we see a proposal for the reduction of funds in the soil conservation program. This is an important part of the plan for the development of maximum productivity in the future. It does not seem to me that we are being farsighted enough in our program planning. Certainly the programs of the past that have been proved successful should not be brushed aside so that new and untried programs can get a start.

Further evidence that agriculture fails to get a fair and equitable share of this new budget is found in the drastic cut in the REA loan program—a program that makes little demand on our Federal resources because the loans are returned with interest and the investment in powerlines adds to the growth and expansion of our rural economy. This brings in more revenue to meet Federal expenses and helps to reduce the pressures to increase taxes.

The budget recommendations ignore the annual survey of rural electric loan applications for fiscal 1967, which show a need of \$675 million, by seeking authorization of only \$220 million in new loan funds. This is one-third the amount required.

Adding to this curtailment of future credit requirements affecting some 10 percent of our population is the curtailment of current authorizations already made by this Congress. This cut amounts to a total of \$132 million. Despite the growing volume of loan applications \$35 million of current loan authorization has been impounded. Further, \$60 million in contingency funds we voted at the last session are to be lost and will not be available to reduce the current program loan needs. Finally some \$37 million of 1965 contingency funds released by the Budget Bureau only after repeated demands by Members of this House are being impounded. It is proposed that some of these funds be held for use in both fiscal 1967 and 1968. The need is now—not a year or so hence. The Congress is aware of this loan need and in its judgment made provision to meet it. Now we learn that the problem is compounded and increased because of Budget Bureau restrictions.

Can this "brownout" of REA credit funds be allowed to grow into a "black-out" for rural and farm areas? How can a farmer plan to go all-electric in adopting new feed programs to step up his animal units if he cannot get a larger transformer, a larger distribution line,

a new substation to feed the growing demand for energy required by him and his neighbors? How can our farmers grow the additional supplies for any international attack on hunger if they cannot get the basic electric energy to increase production, lower costs, and offset labor shortages?

Private utilities announce that their construction investments will soar to \$4.8 billion in the year ahead. Rural and farm people are power minded too. If rural areas are to move forward, if they are to respond to President Johnson's efforts to improve the rural economy, they will need growth and improvement in their electric and telephone systems to be competitive. We hear of plans to organize rural districts through which development of rural plans can be coordinated and moved forward. Yet the Budget Bureau proposes to slash REA credit and slow down the resources of rural America to have adequate, basic electric service.

Again, REA credit is not a "cost" but an investment. If squeeze we must, let's squeeze on doubtful proposals whose value is questionable. Rural electric loans add to the rural economy and expand the tax base and to that extent lessen the pressures for increasing tax rates.

These rural electric systems, nearly 1,000 stretched across this land of ours, are serving some 10 percent of the population. If they are starved for capital funds this large and important segment of our economy will be seriously hurt.

If the budget cut in REA loan authorizations applied across the Nation on an equal basis, the amount of credit available for the additional facilities needed by Iowa rural electric consumers' would be about \$5 per user, or \$750,000 for the 48 operating distribution systems which have an investment of a quarter of a billion dollars. It is just simply not realistic to think the proposed limited appropriation comes anywhere meeting the need.

Rural electric borrowers themselves have taken steps to try and solve this problem through supplementary financial proposals of their own. However, it takes time to get such plans into effective operation. I am pleading for adequate funds now to enable the rural electric systems to keep abreast of their responsibilities until alternative plans can be set up and become workable. Additionally I suggest that a serious analysis be made of the reductions proposed by the Bureau of the Budget in a variety of basic programs and their effect on rural life in America.

TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL REDWOODS PARK

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, similar to that by my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. COBLEAN], to create a Redwoods National Park in northern

February 9, 1966

vertical or horizontal separation, or because of faulty weather reporting, or for other reasons. But each of these faults and inadequacies can be corrected and should be corrected.

The traveling public has the right to fly under the safest possible conditions, not under conditions which are thought to be safe enough, or safe compared to other modes of travel as computed by some statistical method—but under the safest possible conditions. In my opinion, the conditions of air travel could be made considerably safer than they are today.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the article from the New Republic by Leticia Kent.

AERIAL GARBAGE

"Smoking is going to kill us just as sure as the sun comes up in the east (whether or not we can see it) regardless of what the American Medical Association or tobacco experts say. Not cigarette smoking, pipe smoking, or cigars, but the unscrupulous dumping of garbage in the atmosphere. If I sound like I'm off on some kind of a crusade kick, that is only because I am, namely, to see if I can't hit a sensitive nerve in someone's conscience who will have the guts to stand up and be counted by turning the first wheel some place, some way, to put a stop to air pollution before it kills us all, not on the ground but in the air."

So began a recent letter from an airline pilot, Capt. O. M. Cokes, to the Airline Pilots' Association's director of air safety. The letter asserted that near-collisions between aircraft have increased because of smoke pollution "to a point where you have had a dull trip if you don't experience at least one on every sequence as a scheduled airline pilot." The letter went on to accuse the U.S. Weather Bureau of incorrectly reporting the smoke as haze. The official glossary of the Bureau, it said, defines haze, a natural phenomenon, as "salt crystals or dust" and does not include "smoke" in that definition. Smoke is a mixture of soot and dirt. Haze-based fog dissipates quickly in sunshine; smoke-based fog does not.

For years, a pilots' campaign, inspiring letters like Cokes', has been conducted by Capt. William L. Guthrie, pilot and renowned clear air buff. During the recent New York mayoralty race, Guthrie conferred with both the Ryan and Lindsay teams, to no noticeable effect except that the candidates began to allude to "aerial garbage." For years, Guthrie has seen from his cockpit that there exists, nationwide, a blanket of smoke reaching as high as 31,000 feet, which moves with major weather systems. He believes that public efforts to prevent air pollution (such as smoke) cannot begin until the problem is accurately stated and assignment of responsibility correctly made.

Guthrie's allegations (corroborated by 2,300 fellow Eastern Airlines pilots) remain uncontested; but his correspondence and messages to the Federal Aviation Agency, requesting review of inaccurate weather reporting, remain unanswered.

On October 7, Captain Guthrie refused flightdeck access to an FAA inspector, FAA inspectors, representing the public interest, conduct routine en route airline checks and are entitled to access to the pilot's compartment of the aircraft during flight. Guthrie considered that the FAA lacked concern for the public interest in failing to investigate pilot allegations of incorrect weather reports. A disciplined airline pilot with an enviable 35-year record, he apparently deliberately violated Federal aviation regulations. He was grounded, but has appealed the ruling.

"The airline pilot," Guthrie says, "privi-

leged with a front seat from which to view the ever-changing and ever-dirtier sky, has a special interest in demanding correct weather reports. Once smoke is consistently identified, it can be stopped at its source and responsibility for it can be established. By the time pollution gets into the air, there's no way to control it.

"If the Federal Government will simply take the position that the dumping of private property (waste material) in the Nation's sky is undesirable, and set a time schedule of dumping penalties as a deterrent, we will see the ingenuity of our industrial machine producing a clear sky.

"If aerial dumping of waste is severely penalized," Guthrie continued, "then billions of dollars worth of retention and salvage equipment will be designed, manufactured, sold, installed, serviced, replaced by better equipment."

Guthrie's suggestions have already been successfully tried in the town of Palm Beach Shores in Florida, which enacted a 1964 ordinance penalizing aerial dumpers \$20 per ton. When this was done, the local powerplant quickly announced it would convert from residual fuel oil to natural gas, thereby lessening aerial contamination (but not eliminating it). More recently the President's Science Advisory Committee recommended "that careful study be given to taxlike systems in which all polluters would be subject to 'effluent charges' in proportion to their contribution to pollution." Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is interested in offering economic incentives for pollution abatement. Urban critic Jane Jacobs foresees the rise of a new growth industry in our cities concerned with retention and salvage of wastes. Someday, despite depressing indications to the contrary, the problem of aerial garbage may be solved.

UN

THE DELAWARE AIR NATIONAL
GUARD DELIVERS TO VIETNAM
CARGO VITAL TO THE DEFENSE
OF FREEDOM

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

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker the Delaware Air National Guard has just completed another flight to Vietnam delivering cargo vital to the defense of freedom, according to Lt. Col. Forest C. Shoup, its commanding officer.

This flight makes the seventh mission since December 1, 1965, in which Delawareans and their neighbors from Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New Jersey have given freely of their time and talent to carry out a task of major importance.

I take this occasion to commend the members of the Delaware Air National Guard who participated in this mission on a voluntary basis and who took time from their civilian jobs and their families to support the Regular military Air Force in transporting vital materiel to Vietnam. I include as part of my remarks the following letter from Lt. Col. Forest C. Shoup:

142D MILITARY AIRLIFT SQUADRON,
DELAWARE AIR NATIONAL GUARD,
New Castle, Del., January 29, 1966.
Congressman HARRIS B. McDOWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDOWELL: I am happy to inform you that the Delaware Air National Guard has just completed another flight to

Vietnam delivering cargo vital to the defense of freedom.

The men listed below participated in this mission on a voluntary basis taking time from their civilian jobs and families to support the regular military Air Force in transporting materiel to the Far East.

This flight marks the seventh mission since December 1, 1965, in which Delawareans and their neighbors from Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New Jersey have given freely of their time and talent to accomplish a job that must be done.

Best regards,

Forest C. Shoup, Lt. Col., Delaware Air National Guard, Aircraft Commander;
Capt. James A. Moore, 1st Pilot, Havertown, Pa.; Capt. Jack K. Bal, 1st Pilot, Riverside, N.J.; Maj. Hugh P. Goettel, Instructor Navigator, Wilmington, Del.; Capt. Jay R. Herr, Crew Navigator, Lancaster, Pa.; 2d Lt. James R. Sisson, Student Navigator, Media, Pa.; M. Sgt. Floren McNichols, AF Adviser, Wilmington, Del., M. Sgt. John Weber, Flight Engineer, Wilmington, Del.; T. Sgt. Scott Rice, Flight Engineer, University of Delaware; T. Sgt. Bernard W. Coll, Loadmaster, Wilmington, Del.

TOM ADAMS AND THE NATION'S
WATERWAYS

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, there is being held in Washington at the present time a conference by the Mississippi Valley Association attended by over a thousand people whose interests and livelihoods are vitally concerned with the development and utilization of the Nation's waterways.

One of the principal speakers was to be Florida's very capable secretary of state, Tom Adams. Unfortunately he will be unable to be present because of illness. However, and fortunately, he has previously made a very able presentation of the value of waterways to the Nation's economy and of the threat to them represented by a proposal which looms large in the future welfare of inland and intracoastal waterways and the shippers, industries and citizens so dependent upon them—user charges or tolls.

The National Waterways Conference, Inc., of which Tom Adams has been president since 1961, has been sponsoring regional conferences of waterways users and other interested persons at which their problems and future are discussed.

On January 19, 1966, Tom Adams was the principal speaker at such a conference in Little Rock. His address, which I strongly recommend to your attention, has been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, 1966 on page 1639, by Representative CLAUDE PEPPER.

This address was a very able exposition of the multipurpose development of the Nation's water resources, of the full-scaled development of river basins for flood control, water supply, hydro-power, fish and wildlife enhancement, water pollution abatement, recreation, and navigation.

Complete development, to be economically sound must include all of these in-

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. **ASHBROOK**] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. **ASHBROOK** addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ATTEMPTS TO CREATE AN ANTI-MISSISSIPPI ATMOSPHERE BY EMOTIONAL ASSERTIONS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. **WALKER**] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. **WALKER** of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **WALKER** of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1966, a mimeographed letter from my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. **RESNICK**] was circulated to the Members of this body, in which he attempted to create an anti-Mississippi atmosphere by emotional assertions of, "the eviction of the homeless and hungry people from the abandoned Air Force barracks in Greenville, Miss., last week."

I feel that I cannot and must not let these charges go unanswered.

First, I question the motive of the gentleman from New York, and whether he has genuine concern for those on whose behalf he speaks.

I believe that the National Labor Relations Board records will show that on two occasions in a span of 10 years, the Channel Master Corp. had charges relating to their suppression of the rights of his workers successfully prosecuted against him. Can he sincerely be interested in the rights of citizens of Mississippi when he acted in such disregard of the rights of the workers in his own company?

Recently when the gentleman from New York visited my State back during congressional adjournment, he made charges, after only 3 days of visits, that he had found widespread discrimination against Negroes in the Agricultural Stabilization and Soil Conservation Committee elections. Since he was a strong supporter of the illegal Freedom Democratic Party's attempts to unseat the Mississippi congressional delegation, and since his trip to Mississippi was promoted by this same group, I seriously doubt that my colleague could be objective in reaching his conclusions.

As far as the statement in his letter of February 7, regarding a recent takeover of a Greenville Air Force Base by a group calling themselves the Poor Peoples Conference, I cannot understand how the gentleman from New York can condone such unlawful actions. The various left-wing groups whether they be called SNCC, COFO, the Council on Human Relations, the NAACP, the Freedom Democratic Party, or the Poor Peoples Conference, I understand use "freedom of assembly" as their excuse for demonstrations. However, the law does not permit such a group of demonstrators to literally take over Government property. The fact that this property happened to

be inactive at the time is immaterial. The next time it could be the naval air station at Meridian or the Air Force Base at Biloxi. I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent account of this case of illegal trespassing on Government property. The article appeared in the Jackson, Miss., Daily News. It follows: **AIR POLICE ON WAY TO INVADE GREENVILLE BASE**

(By Kenneth Tolliver)

GREENVILLE—Civil rights squatters, 1; Air Force, 0.

That's how the score stood at the end of the first day of the invasion of the Greenville Air Force Base by about 50 Negro and white civil rights workers.

But the score may be different Tuesday. Lt. Col. George Andrew, officer in charge of the old base, said Monday night that air police were being flown to Jackson and would come up by bus to take charge of the situation.

He also said that Gov. Paul B. Johnson had offered the use of the Mississippi Highway Patrol and of the National Guard.

"I think we will see some action tomorrow," he said.

The total on the base was boosted by six Monday night when six more climbed the fence and joined the others inside the building.

The invasion started at 7:15 Monday morning and continued until after lunch.

ROAR THROUGH

Early Monday morning a caravan of cars and a small bus pulled up at the C gate of the 2,000-acre deactivated air base and told the guard they were headed for the Southern Airways ticket office. When the guard protested, they roared through the gate.

The group then broke into a locked Air Force building, moved in complete with sleeping gear and a few suitcases and issued a printed list of demands.

Among the demands made for food, heat, jobs, and training, the group asked to be given the land the base stands on and the more than 200 buildings on the land.

The land belongs to the city of Greenville and the Air Force was in the process of returning the control of it to the city when the invasion occurred.

Ironically, the city of Greenville intends to open a vocational training school and a college at the former base; and classes would be open to white and Negro alike.

The Negroes' statement identified themselves as the Poor People's Conference and claimed connections with the Freedom Democratic Party, Mississippi Labor Union, and the Delta Ministry of the National Council of Churches.

WANT FRESH MEAT

The statement also charged that Federal commodities were "old and full of bugs and weevils" they said they wanted fresh vegetables, fruits and meat. "We want to decide what foods we want to eat," the statement read.

Further demands included that poverty programs be taken out of the hands of county supervisors because "they don't represent us. We want the Office of Economic Opportunity and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to hire poor people we say represent us. We, the poor people, want to distribute the food."

President Johnson was called on to answer the question "whose side are you on, the poor people or the millionaires?"

KICKED COLONEL

The squatters were asked to leave by Colonel Andrew, and for an answer, one of the white civil rights workers kicked him in the shin.

"It might have been accidental," the colonel said later.

About noon more Negroes, including babies and elderly persons arrived and moved into the frame building.

Because the base had been deactivated, no electricity, water, or heat was available and the squatters brought a pair of coal stoves to keep warm.

They broke the glass from two windows under the watch of FBI agents and poked their stovepipes out into the air. They then proceeded to fix lunch.

The demonstrators were openly hostile to reporters and shouted words of contempt to anyone who questioned their actions.

They sang and chanted familiar "freedom songs" and asked all who came near for food, clothing, and jobs.

One Negro asked a Clarion-Ledger reporter to "take me home, I am your brother."

Earlier in the day, the Washington County sheriff's department and the Greenville police had gone to the base to confer with Colonel Andrew but later Washington County Attorney John Webb declared the matter was an Air Force concern and ordered the local law enforcement officers to leave the base.

This action had a visible effect on the Air Force and the 27 civilian employees at the sprawling base.

COLONEL SHRUGS

Colonel Andrew spoke several times with Air Force generals on the telephone, called Washington and consulted with the Justice Department and the Pentagon and ended up with a shrug of his shoulders when asked the results.

"I would like to know myself," he smiled at reporters.

Earlier he said he was concerned with the safety and welfare of the squatters and said that he feared the building might catch fire and burn.

Inside the frame, one-story structure, the demonstrators crowded around their stoves and sang.

Since there are no sanitary facilities operating in the building, they have been stepping outside and relieving themselves in the snow.

Inside, they huddled together in their blankets, both white civil rights workers and Negroes, both male and female.

"Hey, take our picture," a Negro male called to a reporter as he cuddled with a blonde white woman. "This will make news."

FBI agents maintained a watch on the proceedings and took photographs, but made no effort to interfere.

JUST OBSERVING

One agent said that although Government property had been damaged and that a Government building had been broken into, "until the Justice Department issues warrants and makes complaints, we can do nothing but observe."

Sleet and snow were forecast for the area and from all indications the group had no intention of moving on. On the door of the building they had placed a crude sign saying, "This Is Our House—Please Knock."

Attorney James Turner from the Civil Rights Commission in Washington would not comment to reporters after he arrived on the scene, but did say "It is up to the Air Force."

The Air Force may be fierce in Vietnam, but in Mississippi, it seems to have met its match.

The gentleman from New York undoubtedly will make assertions of racial discrimination in my State. I would ask him: How concerned was he when riots in his own State of New York took the lives of 5 people and injured nearly 500 at a cost of nearly \$5 million to his State? The following article that appeared in U.S. News & World Report, September 14, 1964, gave a very accurate account of racial violence in and around

Vietcong to move without getting stained. The dye might also be used to criss-cross the Ho Chi Minh trail to mark many Vietcong and North Vietnamese regulars before they even get to the south. None of these people have any spare clothing to replace that stained. Their skin discoloration would last as long as a suntan. Thus their guerrilla usefulness would be seriously impaired for many weeks while the discoloration persisted.

Inescapably a number of Vietnamese who are not guerrillas would be stained. This is not a serious objection from the military security standpoint since already there exists a monumental problem in separating even unstained Vietnamese between VC and non-VC. Presence of the discoloration would reduce the magnitude of the problem by turning up many, many more guilty suspects to put through the separation process.

It is interesting to note that "dye bombing" is considerably cheaper and more simple than explosives bombing. The latter requires aerodynamically efficient bomb casings, rugged fuses, and other paraphernalia. Dye could be dropped in as simple a container as a wax paper milk carton. TNT bombs cost roughly \$1.25 per pound. Dye bombs would cost only a few cents per pound. The cost of explosive bombs for a single 30-aircraft B-52 raid in Vietnam approaches \$2 million. Dye bombs would cost only a fraction of that sum. Even the addition of fluorescent chemicals such as used in household detergents to produce "whiter than white" laundry would not greatly increase cost. They are harmless and possibly could be made persistent.

In closing it is well to anticipate the bleeding hearts who will throw up their hands and raise their voices in wretched screams over the alleged inhumanity of dyeing people yellow, even if they are killing America's sons. They should become aware of the fact that U.S. chemical companies today are actually selling "people dye" to some countries which use it on election days for the humane and honest purpose of preventing repetitive voting.

They might also recall some million American soldiers and sailors who fought World War II in the Pacific wearing sickly yellow complexions from taking Atabrine to avoid malaria. In this connection the psychological significance of this physically harmless weapon must not be overlooked. It is illustrated by the story of the GI in New Guinea who, being upbraided by his sergeant for sagging morale, quipped, "Yea, but it does something to you to go around looking like a banana month after month."

It is sincerely hoped the President's discussions at Honolulu with military commanders and Republic of Vietnam counterparts may lead to a healthy re-evaluation of the conduct of the war and open up, at least to consideration, fresh ideas regarding it.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT ONE OF THE RESOLUTIONS OFFERED CALLING FOR THE CITATION FOR CONTEMPT OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, during the limited debate in the House on February 2 regarding the seven privileged resolutions from the Committee on Un-American Activities, calling for the citation for contempt of the House of seven witnesses who had been subpoenaed to appear before the committee, I presented a motion to recommit one of the resolutions offered.

That motion to recommit would have referred the resolution to a select committee composed of seven Members of this body, appointed by the Speaker, and instructed to examine the sufficiency of the resolutions for contempt citations under existing rules of law and relevant judicial decisions. After completing such an examination, the committee would have reported the resolutions back to this body with a statement as to its findings.

Along with my colleagues, who offered similar motions and supported my motion for recommitment, I felt there had not been enough time allowed for thorough study and thoughtful deliberation of the resolutions and the consequences which would ensue from their passage. The motion to recommit was defeated by a vote of the Members of this body. However, my conviction that the proposed procedure of that motion is a sound and much more justiciable one than that under which we presently operate has not been lessened by the action taken here in this instance. The experience we have just had, under the rules now dictating the action of this body in the consideration of citations for contempt, is an apt illustration of the weaknesses and summary unfairness of our present procedure.

The issues before this body in its consideration of the resolutions were complex, posing intricate and involved questions of fact and law. The rights and privileges of the individuals cited for contempt, as well as those of the House, as a body, were inextricably intertwined with the question whether there had, in fact, been a contempt of the House.

It was a serious threat to the propriety of the results and an assault on the propriety of the procedure that the statements of fact, the hearing records, and the actual text of the citations were not available to the Members for a period of time sufficient to study the issues, to weigh the facts, and then to arrive at a reasonable balance of the interests involved.

We are charged, in situations such as this, with the responsibility of initiating a serious Federal proceeding. That responsibility can hardly be competently discharged when the facts of the case are virtually unknown to us. The important

documents containing the record of the proceedings out of which the citations for contempt originated, when printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, covered some 63 pages of triple-column, fine print. Yet, they were not available to the Members until the start of the meeting of the House during which the votes were to be taken.

I believe it is evident from the wording of my motion that my dissatisfaction was not with the work of the committee nor a protective move for any organization which has, or will be, investigated by it. My concern was a procedural one, as was indicated by my vote for the resolutions, while offering and voting for the motion for recommitment of the resolution.

I also believe the integrity and effectiveness of the sanction of citation for contempt of the Congress must be preserved. The action taken by the House, in the manner it was taken on February 2, does a disservice to this important right of the House to the extent that it dissipates the effectiveness of our action and lessens the credibility of the charges made. Such has been the case in the past with unfortunate results. The record shows some 93 percent of the citations coming out of the House have not resulted in convictions.

The efficacy of the present procedure is challenged by the fact that such a large number of the contempt citations initiated by this body have turned sour. The absolute necessity for reform of that procedure is evident from the low percentage of convictions which have been obtained by the Federal proceedings ensuing from our actions.

Therefore, I am joining today the company of a number of my distinguished colleagues who have introduced legislation for procedural improvements in contempt citations by the Congress, by filing legislation providing that resolutions for these citations be handled, as a permanent part of the procedure of the Congress, in the manner proposed by the language of my recommitment motion.

One does not have to be a legal scholar to realize the inequities and injustices of our present procedure. Nor need one be a statistician to see the virtual ineffectiveness of that procedure.

We must take action now to uphold this sanction of the Congress for the preservation of its rights and the dignities of its member bodies. The lip-service we have paid the existing procedure in the past has served to remove the sting from this sanction. The continued erosion will soon find us without means of enforcement where the will of this body or its committees has been unjustifiably defied.

I am proud to add my name to the roster of the Members of this body who have introduced this legislation. I urge its early consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, while the lesson we have once again been taught by these recent proceedings is fresh in the minds of us all.

Thank you.

The U.N. resolution which gives rise to today's discussion was adopted on December 18, 1965. The essence of the resolution is that the General Assembly:

1. Takes cognizance of the fact that the Republic of Cyprus, as an equal member of the United Nations, is, in accordance with the charter of the United Nations, entitled to and should enjoy full sovereignty and complete independence without any foreign intervention or interference;

2. Calls upon all states, in conformity with their obligations under the charter, and in particular article 2, paragraphs 1 and 4, to respect the sovereignty, unity, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from any intervention directed against it;

3. Recommends to the Security Council the continuation of the United Nations mediation work in conformity with Resolution 186 (1964).

The resolution was adopted 47 to 5, with 54 abstentions. The United States, voting "No," found itself joined only by Turkey, Iran, Albania, and Pakistan, an unlikely combination to say the least.

I know that there are some who will jump to the conclusion that this vote indicates that the United States favors Turkey in the dispute. If so, they misread our position. I do not believe we have arrayed ourselves irrevocably or even temporarily in favor of either one side or the other.

Let us analyze the vote. The yes votes were gathered largely from Africa and a scattering of Latin American and Asian nations. Abstaining were the entire Soviet bloc and all of Western Europe. This certainly suggests that there was something more to the issue than a mere reaffirmation of the general principle of self-determination. It must be admitted, however, that the abstentions made possible the passage of the resolution.

America's vote must be viewed in the light of the subtle diplomatic considerations involved. These include our standing with our Turkish ally, which we twice restrained from invading Cyprus in 1964, the belief that the United Nations may weaken its influence in the dispute if it favors one side over the other, and the necessity of looking at the substance, not only the appearance, of the resolution.

What was the purpose of the resolution? Speaking as one sympathetic to the Greek majority on the island, I must observe that, while the resolution seemed to call for merely an endorsement of the right of self-determination, it was actually a well-considered political maneuver.

I do not condemn the Greek Cypriot leadership for this. We can admire their political astuteness in undertaking such a tactic while reserving our right to put the tactic in perspective.

The adoption of the U.N. resolution was calculated to improve the bargaining position of the Greek Cypriots by bringing pressure of world public opinion to bear in their favor. But it provides no panaceas; it advances no real solutions. The Turkish Government cannot be expected to yield to the opinion expressed. Realistically, the Turkish Government can be expected to ignore it.

What are the realities in Cyprus? One of the realities can be summed up in the words "No more Zurich's." That is, there can be no longer be any prospect of an imposed agreement, as happened in Zurich in 1960. True, agreements between governments require compromise, but the Zurich Agreement contained such awkward compromises that it was inevitable the formula would break down.

While the Zurich agreement professed to follow the general principle of "majority rule with guaranteed minority rights" the practical effect was that a veto was given to the Turkish minority and effective government was stalemated.

Some may regret that the Turkish Cypriots, one-fifth of the island's population, should have such importance, in view of the fact that they did not significantly participate in the resistance against the British "when the rock devoured the unjust mountain." There is bitterness over the fact that the Turkish Cypriots were boosted to equal rank by the British policies of the 1950's, which sought to play one side off against the other. But the Turkish "awakening" is nevertheless a fact; the views of the Turkish Cypriots cannot be ignored. All parties must deal with the situation as it is rather than as it might have been which can also be said about our involvement in other parts of the world.

Quiet reigns on the island today, an uneasy quiet. There have been few incidents during the past year. This can be attributed partly to the presence of the 7,000-man U.N. force and partly also to the apparent belief by both sides that time favors them.

The Turkish minority seems to feel that by staying in its enclaves it emphasizes that the Turks cannot live peacefully among the Greeks and thus its demands for partition as the only solution is reinforced. The Greek majority, with 80 percent of the population and even higher percentages of the wealth and the educated elite, controls the island's government and economy. They feel that they can afford to sit tight, and that eventually the Turks will decide to leave their enclaves.

In my judgment, there is no early solution in sight. What is clear is that no "agreement" is viable without the participation and approval of Archbishop Makarios. Indeed, now that Cyprus has become an internal political issue in Turkey, the views of the Turkish Cypriots must be taken very seriously in Ankara. Thus, there can be no bilateral Athens-Ankara agreement nor an agreement imposed by the great powers. This means that eventually there must be serious talks between the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots.

Enosis is on the back burner, but eventually it must be considered a likely development. It may take 5, 10, 20 or 50 years but it almost certainly will come to pass. After all, it was the drive for Enosis—together with a thirst for freedom—that generated the revolt against the British. And Enosis remains in the hearts of the Greek Cypriots today.

Nationalism is by far the strongest "ism" on the island. But it is a na-

tionism which yearns for attachment to the respective mainlands. Recent visitors to the island capital of Nicosia tell me that you see Greek flags and Turkish flags flying but the only Cyprus flag to be seen flies over the Cyprus museum. This indicates that the motherlands count for more with the people than any feeling of Cypriot nationhood. Indeed, it suggests that the Zurich Agreement making Cyprus an independent nation was only an unavoidable intermediate step.

The United States must exercise tact and patience in exploring gently and cautiously the prospects for agreement.

In this regard, Dean Acheson's 1964 efforts to mediate are to be commended. The temper of the participants and the course of events may some day reactivate his unofficial proposals as a basis for renewed negotiations.

In general, Mr. Acheson suggested Enosis, with the renunciation of Turkish rights of intervention, in exchange for the leasing of a Turkish or NATO base on the island and the transfer of a small island in the Dodecanese to Turkey.

And what of the Soviet Union? The Russians have constantly shifted position, playing for their own personal advantage. They support no alternative to instability. They shrink from Enosis, for it would bring NATO to Cyprus. They do not favor partition, for it would bring NATO to Cyprus twice. They are unlikely, therefore, to play a constructive role.

Although no early solution is visible, things seem to be moving gradually in favor of Archbishop Makarios and the Greek population, which is overwhelmingly devoted to him. The main danger to peace, they feel, does not come from forces within the island, but from a Turkish government which may grow impatient and mount an invasion. A delicate waiting game is being played, edged in danger. Well-intentioned mediators must tread softly.

Secretary General U Thant, in his latest report on Cyprus, said in December 1965:

The U.N. force is needed in Cyprus. It may be no exaggeration to say that it has become almost indispensable for the time being. On the other hand, it would seem clear that it cannot be kept there indefinitely; possibly not even for very much longer. Financial stringencies alone would probably dictate this, although there are other considerations which would make such a prolongation undesirable * * * one of the latter being that overreliance on the United Nations to prevent recourse to armed force and even to help maintain the status quo could be a factor in reducing the sense of urgency of the contending parties about seeking solutions for the underlying differences that caused the eruption of violence in the first place.

U Thant also said that—

The key to the settlement lies in the last analysis, with the parties primarily concerned.

He expressed the conclusion that:

Mediation in some form offers the main hope for a breakthrough to future harmony and tranquility in that troubled isle.

In this context, the U.N. resolution is not decisive. It is a phase. The main

steps to eventual and permanent peace remain to be taken.

We are all for self-determination. But how do we apply it? This is the challenge to the patience and wisdom of all interested parties.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, and that all other Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

THE JOHNSON-McNAMARA MISCALCULATION OF THE WAY TO BEAT VIETCONG GUERRILLAS AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, we now have almost 300,000 fighting men in South Vietnam. The number is increasing rapidly. Soon it may reach half a million. Fast becoming apparent is the probability of the United States getting bogged down in an Asian land war—the trap that delights the Communists of Peiping and Moscow alike—and is the very thing Gen. Douglas MacArthur warned against saying, "No sane men would get into a war like this."

Although most Americans fly their flags high in support of the men fighting and dying in Vietnam, by the millions they are beginning to suspect something is tragically wrong with the way President Johnson and Secretary McNamara are running the war. It is an unconventional war. Its time and place were the choices of the enemy. Its war of liberation strategy and guerrilla tactics were chosen by the enemy. The Johnson-McNamara response to this unconventional challenge has been the troop build-up. In light of the MacArthur warning this may well be seen through Hanoi's eyes as to its advantage, not to ours.

The reason is simple. Secretary McNamara himself has declared that a 10 to 1 manpower superiority ratio is needed to overwhelm Vietcong guerrilla forces. It is estimated that at the beginning of this year some 225,000 Vietcong were in action. The Defense Secretary believes Hanoi is capable of sustaining up to 300,000 Vietcong in the field. Application of his 10 to 1 ratio reveals a need for 2 1/4 to 3 million men on our side fighting against them. Not over one-half million of these ever are likely to be South Vietnamese troops. Few of our so-called allies are likely to come up with any substantial manpower. The net result of calculations of this kind is that six to eight times the number of Americans fighting overseas at the height of the Korean war will be needed in Vietnam.

Moreover, even if we achieved such a superiority ratio—which is highly unlikely on a regional basis, let alone

throughout South Vietnam—there is a chapter in the guerrilla handbook which instructs the Vietcong exactly what to do. They are simply told to slip back up to the Ho Chi Minh Trail long enough to get us in a mood "to bring the boys home," then slip back down again the moment the ratio reduces to their favor and pursue their drive for conquest to success.

If we are to achieve in Vietnam whatever will legitimately pass for a victory, we cannot do it by playing patsy for the enemy's unconventional warfare strategy and tactics. In the end it is sure to defeat us, no matter what euphoric terminological inexactitudes the administration uses to filter, flavor, disguise and deodorize the outcome.

An unconventional war must be fought unconventionally if it is to be fought successfully. Last Monday I mentioned to the House a number of psychological warfare actions that might be productive in North Vietnam. Many of these might be put to effective use against the Vietcong in the south. By strumming on the myths, superstitions and ignorance of the Vietcong their morale and will to fight can be damaged severely. Already we have in South Vietnam an intelligent and dedicated group of U.S. Information Agency and military experts trained and wise in the ways of psychological war. They are not getting the encouragement and not given the freedom to operate they should be. They should be unleashed and enthusiastically financed and supported. In the past they have experienced difficulty even in getting necessary aircraft to drop pamphlets and communicate recorded messages by loudspeakers.

At the same time, President Johnson and Secretary McNamara—who are tightly running this war—must get released from their self-hypnotic vision that the way to overcome guerrillas is to immobilize them beneath the sheer weight of vast numbers of Americans in uniform. The "10 to 1 technique" was used successfully by the British in Malaysia only because the number of guerrillas was relatively small. Even there the successful outcome was due less to getting a heavy manpower superiority than it was to the fact that the British managed to develop dossiers on almost every last guerrilla. Many dossiers even included the subject's photograph to further assist in the identification process.

In short, the President and his Secretary have tragically miscalculated what it takes to defeat guerrillas. It is not principally numbers of antiguerrillas, but numbers in combination with identification of who the guerrillas are. Identification is the key factor because it denies guerrillas the use of guerrilla tactics and they just are not guerrillas anymore.

The situation in Vietnam explains why. The Vietcong do not wear uniforms. They never have. They never will. They wear the same "black pajama" costume all Vietnamese wear. They hide in the forests and rice paddies and in the mangrove swamps. Often our soldiers on land and sailors patrolling the inland waterways have no way to join battle with them except to discover their whereabouts by getting shot at, then

firing back in the general direction from which the bullets are coming. The unrecognized Vietnamese walking past you in a village by day may be the Vietcong guerrilla attacking you by night. Such attacks can, and do, occur almost anywhere in South Vietnam. Vietnamese workers on a U.S. base may be the plastic explosives sabotage experts who infiltrate that base under cover of darkness to destroy our aircraft and blow up Americans—or even bicycle boldly up to a barracks in Saigon and bomb it.

They successfully get away with their guerrilla tactics because it is difficult, if not impossible, to identify them. More often than not they slip away from the scene of their carnage for the same reason. As long ago as 1776 by cutting to pieces George III's Redcoated regulars Massachusetts guerrillas proved that "hit and hide" tactics are essential for a 10th-class power to bring a 1st-class power to its knees. If you let them get away with it by letting them keep on hiding, the same result can be expected in 1966, a full 190 years later.

It makes no sense whatever to neglect the use of any effective and civilized means there may be to identify the Vietcong. It only makes dead and wounded Americans. Yet a great hullabaloo went up when our commanders in Vietnam took the simple, humane initiative to use common teargas to flush guerrillas from hiding places. The use of this non-lethal and only temporarily disabling chemical was equated with the release by the Germans of deadly cruel and terrible gases during World War I. The resulting shock wave reverberated the Johnson-McNamara political antennae and almost prohibitive restrictions were slapped on the use of measures against the Vietcong which any police chief can use against Americans in any city of the United States. Fortunately they have been eased somewhat.

Tear gas has its specialized use and is not valuable as a generalized means of wide scale Vietcong identification. There are several ingenious, practical and relatively cheap and simple suggestions for going about this. I will discuss one of them today. It is the use of a harmless, long-lasting bright yellow dye to stain their clothing and their persons. Dyeing the Vietcong could, in the end, prove more effective than killing them.

Throughout South Vietnam there is almost continuous bombing by aircraft of suspected Vietcong concentrations located by intelligence means. It can be seen frequently from the rooftops of Saigon. Last year 1 ton of bombs costing about \$2,500 per ton was dropped for every Vietcong in action. Not too many Vietcong are killed, even by colossal B-52 raids, simply because it is blind, area bombing. The Vietcong cannot be seen beneath a cover of tropical growth. A clever effort to locate and bomb them around their hidden cooking fires at mealtime using infrared heat detectors was quickly foiled. The Vietcong simply began lighting a large number of fires and cooking over only a few of them.

If instead of dropping TNT bombs over an area, an equal tonnage of dye were dropped, it would not be possible for the

man Act. The three banks not exempted by the bill would be measurably helped by a new uniform test that does not put all of the eggs in the antitrust basket.

One of those is the State of my distinguished friend from Missouri, one is Tennessee, and another is California. Those three banks merged after the decision of the court. They knew they were subject to the antitrust laws. The Department said, "Do not merge." They merged.

The House said, "You will have to fight it out in court."

In connection with the merger which occurred in the State of my distinguished friend from Missouri, it appears to me that the Department of Justice might well reexamine its decision to bring this suit, particularly in the light of the new standards provided in the bill for judging the propriety of bank mergers. In the House committee report, which I obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD yesterday for the information of the Senate, the committee expressed its deep concern over the manner in which that case was handled. The facts which caused the committee to express its concern are set forth in detail in the supplemental views of the Congressman from Missouri. I share that concern.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the situation with respect to others that merged prior to that time?

Mr. ROBERTSON. They are all in the clear under the proposed bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. The mergers will be viewed as an accomplished fact, notwithstanding any difference of opinion in the Department of Justice?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct. There is no statute of limitations. They cannot go back on it under the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I believe that is the salutary part of the bill. There has been much confusion, great expense, and great difficulty occasioned by what has seemed to be the picayunish position of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation for the fine tribute given me by the Senator from Texas and others for my work in connection with this legislation.

Really, it has been more than a matter of months; it goes back to 1956, when I worked with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. At that time we were able to get a bill through the Senate, but could not get it through the House. The Senator from Arkansas then left the Committee on Banking and Currency to become chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I sponsored a bill in 1959. It passed both bodies in 1960. We thought the issue had been settled, but the Supreme Court unsettled it.

Then I sponsored one bill last year, and we have been working with it ever since.

I thank the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency for the fine support they have given me on the bill.

I thank the members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency for agreeing on a bill, because, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] says, this is a very vital matter, one which is necessary to set some disputed points at rest. I commend the House for passing the bill by an almost unanimous vote. And I want to pay a special tribute to Congressman ASHLEY of Ohio for his work in connection with this bill. His untiring and constructive efforts have brought about the virtual unanimity in the House Committee and the House itself.

I commend the friendly spirit of my colleagues on the committee who did not want to kill the bill, but who did think there should be some changes in it. After making their position clear, they said they would not go to the point of filibustering against the bill or trying to kill it.

I pay special thanks to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] for arranging to bring the bill up today.

I do not have words at my command to thank the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], who is the ranking Republican member of the committee. I really do not know how I could function without him. I never make a move without first asking his advice. He is a wonderful, able man, sound in his views. It is a great pleasure to work on a committee with a man like the Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the Senate bank merger bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to concur in the amendment of the House was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to. VN

THE ILLEGALITY OF THE UNDECLARED WAR IN VIETNAM—THE ANSWER OF THE SPECIAL LAWYERS' COMMITTEE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the last 2 years while I have stood shoulder to shoulder with the able and distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in opposing U.S. military involvement in Vietnam, we have repeatedly asserted that the United States is there engaged in an undeclared war—a war contrary to the express provisions of our Constitution.

Last September Senator MORSE and I invited the attention of the Senate to a memorandum of law prepared by a number of eminent and learned lawyers, grouped together in a Lawyers' Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam, which fully supported our questioning the legality, under the Constitution, of our military activities in Vietnam.

Among those endorsing the memorandum of law are Profs. Quincy Wright, of the University of Virginia; Wolfgang Friedmann, of Columbia University;

Thomas I. Emerson, of Yale; Richard A. Falk, of Princeton; Norman Malcolm, of Cornell; D. F. Fleming, of Vanderbilt; David Haber, of Rutgers; Roy M. Mersky, of the University of Texas; William G. Rice, of the University of Wisconsin; Chancellor Robert M. MacIver, of the New School for Social Research; Profs. Robert C. Stevenson, of Idaho State University; Alexander W. Rudzinski, of Columbia; Darrell Randell, of the American University in Washington, D.C., and Profs. Wallace McClure and William W. Van Alstyne, both from Duke University and the World Rule of Law Center.

The lawyers' committee itself is headed by an able and distinguished lawyer, the former attorney general of the State of California, the Honorable Robert W. Kenny, as honorary chairman.

On January 25, 1966, the lawyers' committee sent that memorandum of law to the President saying in part:

The rule of law is the essential foundation of stability and order, both between societies and in international relations. When we violate the law ourselves, we cannot expect respect for the rule of law by others. Our present unilateral intervention is an offense, we submit, against the spirit of American institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the lawyers' committee and the memorandum of law on American policy toward Vietnam be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

LAWYERS COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN
POLICY TOWARD VIETNAM,
New York, N.Y., January 25, 1966.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Following the issuance by the Department of State in March 1965 of a memorandum captioned "Legal Basis for U.S. Actions Against North Vietnam", our committee, in consultation with leading authorities in the fields of international law and constitutional law, undertook to research the legal issues, culminating in the memorandum of law (here enclosed).

Our committee's memorandum of law has been endorsed, among others, by Profs. Quincy Wright of the University of Virginia, Wolfgang Friedmann of Columbia University, Thomas I. Emerson of Yale, Richard A. Falk of Princeton, Norman Malcolm of Cornell, D. F. Fleming of Vanderbilt, David Haber of Rutgers, Roy M. Mersky of the University of Texas, William G. Rice of the University of Wisconsin, Chancellor Robert M. MacIver of the New School for Social Research, Prof. Robert C. Stevenson of Idaho State University, Alexander W. Rudzinski of Columbia, Darrell Randell of the American University in Washington, D.C., and Profs. Wallace McClure and William W. Van Alstyne, both from Duke University and the World Rule of Law Center.

For the reasons documented in our memorandum our committee has reached the regrettable but inescapable conclusion that the actions of the United States in Vietnam contravene the essential provisions of the United Nations Charter, to which we are bound by treaty; violate the Geneva Accords, which we pledged to observe; are not sanctioned by the treaty creating the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; and violate our own Constitution and the system of checks and balances which is the heart of it, by the prosecution of the war in Vietnam without a congressional declaration of war.

February 9, 1966

The principal argument advanced in the State Department's memorandum is that our Government's action in Vietnam is justified under article 51 of the United Nations Charter sanctioning "individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations". However, South Vietnam is indisputably not a member of the United Nations and, indeed, under the Geneva accords of 1954, is merely a temporary zone. Moreover, since the Geneva accords recognized all of Vietnam as a single state, the conflict in Vietnam is civil strife and foreign intervention is forbidden. We do well to recall that President Lincoln, in the course of our Civil War to preserve the union of the North and the South, vigorously opposed British and French threats to intervene in behalf of the independence of the Confederacy.

In addition, the right of collective self-defense under article 51 is limited to those nations which are within a regional community which history and geography have developed into a regional collective defense system. The United States—a country separated by oceans and thousands of miles from southeast Asia and lacking historical or ethnic connections with the peoples of that area—cannot qualify as a bona fide member of a regional collective defense system for southeast Asia.

The State Department's memorandum also contends that the actions of the United States "being defensive in character and designed to resist armed aggression, are wholly consistent with the purposes and principles of the charter and specifically with article 2, paragraph 4." Yet article 2, paragraph 4 declares in clear and unambiguous language that "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations".

The State Department's memorandum also attempts to justify our Government's actions in Vietnam on the ground that the "North Vietnamese have repeatedly violated the 1954 Geneva accords." But this statement ignores our Government's antecedent violations of the pledges we made. On July 21, 1954, Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith in a declaration confirmed by President Eisenhower, pledged that our Government would not "disturb" the Geneva accords and would "not join in an arrangement which would hinder" the rights of peoples "to determine their own future." However, the United States departed from these pledges when on July 16, 1955, the Diem regime announced, with American backing, that it would defy the provision calling for national elections, thus violating the central condition which had made the Geneva accords acceptable to the Vietminh. And the United States also chose to ignore the ban on the introduction of troops, military personnel, arms and munitions into Vietnam and the prohibition against the establishment of new military bases in Vietnam territory—provisions set out in the Geneva accords. It is a historical fact that the refusal to hold the elections prescribed by the Geneva accords coupled with the reign of terror and suppression instituted by the Diem regime precipitated the civil war.

In the light of the foregoing, more fully detailed and documented in the enclosed memorandum, we submit, Mr. President, that the State Department has incorrectly advised you as to the legality of U.S. actions against Vietnam.

We further submit, Mr. President, that the frequent citation of the pledges given by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy to aid South Vietnam afford no justification for U.S. intervention in Vietnam. President Eisenhower has stated that his administration had made no commitment to South

Vietnam "in terms of military support on programs whatsoever." President Kennedy insisted that the war in Vietnam was "their war" and promised only equipment and military advisers. Hence the historical facts fail to support the point advanced. Beyond this, these Presidential pledges do not even have the status of treaties, not having been ratified by the Senate. Manifestly, the obligations assumed by our Government under the United Nations Charter with the advice and consent of the Senate, transcend any Presidential pledge undertaken vis-a-vis the South Vietnamese regime.

Our Government has often urged that our presence in South Vietnam is solely to preserve freedom for its people and to uphold the democratic process. Yet the series of regimes supported by the United States in South Vietnam have been authoritarian in character, quite without popular support and largely indifferent to the welfare of the local population. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, on June 30, 1964, commenting on the consequences of massive American involvement in Vietnam, stated, "Well, that means we become a colonial power and I think it's been pretty well established that colonialism is over. I believe that if you start doing that you will get all kinds of unfortunate results: you'll stir up anti-foreign feeling; there'll be a tendency to lay back and let the Americans do it and all that. I can't think that it's a good thing to do."

As we have stated, our committee has also come to the painful conclusion that our Government's action in Vietnam violates the clear provision of our Constitution which vests in Congress exclusively the power to declare war—a power not constitutionally granted to the President. The debates in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia make explicitly clear that warmaking was to be a purely legislative prerogative and the President was not to have the power to wage a war or commit our Nation to the waging of a war, although the Executive was intended to have the power to repel sudden attacks.

In pointing out that the President lacks constitutional power to make war, our committee does not imply that a declaration of war by the Congress is desirable. Rather, we mean to point out that the failure to abide and conform to the provisions of our Constitution inevitably lead to tragic situations.

In alerting the American people to the unconstitutionality of the war being waged in Vietnam, we are following the example followed by Abraham Lincoln who, in a speech made on January 12, 1848, before the House of Representatives opposing the war undertaken by President Polk, set out the reasons which impelled him to vote for a resolution which declared that "the war with Mexico was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President."

Our committee conducted its research because of a deep sense of responsibility as members of the bar and because of our dedication to the principle of world peace through law. It was the American lawyers who conceived and nurtured this principle, and after holding conferences on four continents (San Jose, Costa Rica; Tokyo, Japan; Lagos, Nigeria; Rome, Italy), finally convened the First World Conference on World Peace Through Law at Athens, Greece, in July 1963.

In the proclamation of Athens, the declaration of general principles for a world rule of law, among other things, declared that, "All obligations under international law must be fulfilled and all rights thereunder must be exercised in good faith."

Mr. President, we submit that our Government's intervention in Vietnam falls far short of the declaration of principles at Athens, Greece, in July 1963, and is in violation of international agreements. The rule of law is the essential foundation of stability and order, both between societies and in in-

ternational relations. When we violate the law ourselves, we cannot expect respect for the rule of law by others. Our present unilateral intervention is an offense, we submit against the spirit of American institutions.

As lawyers, we feel that the national interest is best served—indeed, it can only be served—by (a) a commitment that our Government will be bound by and implement the principles of the Geneva accords of 1954, and that the main provisions thereof be the basis for the establishment of an independent, unified, neutral Vietnam; (b) an invocation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter to assure peace in southeast Asia; and (c) a declaration that there will be no further bombing of Vietnam, that we will agree to a cease-fire, and publicly declare that the United States is willing to negotiate directly with the National Liberation Front—a point endorsed by leading Senators and Secretary General Thant and mandated by article 33 of the United Nations Charter requiring that "The parties to any dispute * * * shall first of all, seek a solution by negotiation * * * or other peaceful means of their own choice," and that all elements of the South Vietnamese people should be represented in that country's postwar government.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT W. KENNY,
Honorary Chairman.
WILLIAM L. STANDARD,
Chairman.

AMERICAN POLICY VIS-A-VIS VIETNAM, IN LIGHT OF OUR CONSTITUTION, THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER, THE 1954 GENEVA ACCORDS, AND THE SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

(Prepared by Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam, Hon. Robert W. Kenny, Honorary Chairman)

Executive committee: William L. Standard, chairman; Carey McWilliams, vice chairman; Joseph H. Crown, secretary.

Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam, 38 Park Row, New York, N.Y.

AMERICAN POLICY VIS-A-VIS VIETNAM

The justification of American involvement* in Vietnam has troubled lawyers in the light of the literal language of our Constitution and the United Nations Charter. Though the United States initially entered South Vietnam only to advise, American troops, now numbering 125,000,¹ have moved from a passive to an active combat role. American forces have mounted repeated air strikes against targets in North Vietnam. Is such action, raising the threat of large-scale war, consonant with our Constitution, our obligations under the United Nations Charter, the provisions of the southeast Asia collective defense treaty?

Observance of the rule of law is a basic tenet of American democracy. Hence it is fitting that American lawyers examine the action pursued by your Government to deter-

*For a historical background, see "Robert Scheer, 'How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam' (A Report to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Post Office Box 4068, Santa Barbara, Calif., 93103); sample copy free.

¹President Johnson, in his news conference of July 29, 1965, stated:

"I have today ordered to Vietnam the Air Mobile Division and certain other forces which will raise our fighting strength from 75,000 to 125,000 men almost immediately. Additional forces will be needed later, and they will be sent as requested." (Presidential Documents, vol. 1, No. 1, p. 15, Aug. 2, 1965.)

mine whether our Government's conduct is justified under the rule of law mandated by the United Nations Charter, a charter adopted to banish from the earth the scourge of war.

We shall explore and assess the grounds advanced to justify the course of conduct pursued by our Government vis-a-vis Vietnam. In section I, we examine American policy in the light of the United Nations; in section II, in the light of the Geneva accords and the southeast Asia collective defense treaty; and in sections III-IV in the light of our Constitution. Mindful of the grave importance of the issues, we have exercised the maximum diligence in the preparation of this memorandum which is fully documented.

I. The United States in Vietnam: The United Nations Charter

The charter of the United Nations was signed on behalf of the United States on June 26, 1945, by the President of the United States, and was ratified on July 28, 1945, by the Senate.² Thus, the United States became a signatory to the charter, along with 55 other nations (there are now 114), obligating itself to outlaw war, to refrain from the unilateral use of force against other nations, and to abide by the procedures embodied in the charter for the settlement of differences between States. In essence, the obligations assumed by member nations under the United Nations Charter represent the principles of international law which govern the conduct of members of the United Nations and their legal relations.

The Charter of the United Nations is a presently effective treaty binding upon the Government of the United States because it is the "supreme law of the land."³ Indeed, the charter constitutes the cornerstone of a world system of nations which recognize that peaceful relations, devoid of any use of force or threats of force, are the fundamental legal relations between nations. The following provisions of the charter are relevant:

(a) "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations" (ch. I, art. II(4)).

(b) "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and shall make recommendations or shall decide what measures shall be taken * * * to maintain or restore international peace and security." (Ch. VII, 39.)

² See Historical Note under title 22, United States Code, sec. 287. By the act of Dec. 20, 1945, c. 583, 59 Stat. 619 (22 U.S.C. 287-287e), Congress enacted "The United Nations Participation Act of 1945," empowering the President to appoint representatives to the United Nations and to render various forms of assistance to the United Nations and the Security Council under specified terms and conditions.

³ The treaties to which the United States is a signatory are a part of the fundamental law, binding upon all officials and all governmental institutions. Art. I, sec. 2, clause 2, of the U.S. Constitution confers power upon the President to make treaties with the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate. Art. VI, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution provides that treaties so made, together with the Constitution and the laws of the United States made pursuant thereto, are "the Supreme Law of the Land." *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416, 432-434; *Hines v. Davidowitz*, 312 U.S. 52, 62-63; *United States v. Pink*, 315 U.S. 203, 230-231; *Clark v. Allen*, 331 U.S. 503-508.

It is thus plain that signatory members of the United Nations Charter are barred from resorting to force unilaterally and that only the Security Council is authorized to determine the measures to be taken to maintain or restore international peace (apart from the question as to whether or not the General Assembly has any residual authority by virtue of the "Uniting for Peace" resolution for this purpose when the Security Council is unable to meet its responsibilities).⁴

It may be recalled that in 1956, Israel justified its attack on the Egyptian forces in the Sinai Peninsula "as security measures to eliminate the Egyptian Fedayeen 'commando' bases in the Sinai Peninsula from which raids had been launched across the Israeli frontier." Starke, "Introduction to International Law," fourth edition, London, 1958, at page 83 et seq.

When Great Britain and France introduced their troops into the Sinai Peninsula, under claim of a threat to their vital interests, the "preponderant reaction of the rest of the world was to condemn this action as *inter alia*, a breach of the United Nations Charter." Starke, "Introduction to International Law," fourth edition, London, 1958, at pages 85-88.

When the Soviet Union suggested a joint military operation with the United States to restore the peace in the Middle East, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, rejected this proposal as "unthinkable" (New York Times, Nov. 6, 1956). Dulles declared:

"Any intervention by the United States and/or Russia, or any other action, except by a duly constituted United Nations peace force would be counter to everything the General Assembly and the Secretary General of the United Nations were charged by the charter to do in order to secure a United Nations police cease-fire."

At a news conference on November 8, 1956, President Eisenhower, answering an announcement of the Soviet Union at that time, declared that the United States would oppose the dispatch of Russian "volunteers" to aid Egypt, saying that it would be the duty of all United Nations members, including the United States, under the clear mandate of the United Nations Charter to counter any Soviet military intervention in the Middle East. The President said:

"The United Nations is alone charged with the responsibility of securing the peace in the Middle East and throughout the world." United Nations Action in the Suez Crisis. Tulane Studies in Political Science, volume IV entitled "International Law in the Middle East Crisis."

To the fundamental substantive and procedural requirements and conditions vesting sole authority in the United Nations to authorize utilization of force, there are only two exceptions set forth in the charter. The first exception is found in article 51 of chapter 7:

"Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures to maintain international peace and security."

Article 51 of the charter marked a serious restriction on the traditional right of self-defense. As was stated by Prof. Philip C. Jessup in his work, "A Modern Law of Nations," published in 1947 (at pp. 165-166):

"Article 51 of the charter suggests a further limitation on the right of self-defense: it may be exercised only 'if an armed attack occurs.' * * * This restriction in article 51 very definitely narrows the freedom of action which states had under traditional

⁴ The constitutional validity of the "Uniting for Peace" resolution adopted in 1950, is disputed.

law. A case could be made out for self-defense under the traditional law where the injury was threatened but no attack had yet taken place. Under the charter, alarming military preparations by a neighboring state would justify a resort to the Security Council, but would not justify resort to anticipatory force by the state which believed itself threatened."⁵

The traditional right of self-defense, even prior to the adoption of the United Nations charter, was limited. As stated by Secretary of State Daniel Webster in the Caroline case,⁶ and as adopted in the Neurenberg Judgment in 1945, any resort to armed force in self-defense must be confined to cases in which "the necessity of that self-defense is instant, overwhelming and leaving no choice of means and no moment of deliberation."⁷

In expressly limiting independent military action to instances of armed attack, the founding nations explicitly and implicitly rejected the right to the use of force based on the familiar claim of "anticipatory self-defense," or "intervention by subversion," or "pre-emptive armed attack to forestall threatened aggression," and similar rationale. Such concepts were well known to the founding nations if only because most of the wars of history had been fought under banners carrying or suggesting these slogans. More importantly for our purposes here, however, the United States was aware of these precepts before the Senate ratified the United Nations Charter and consciously acquiesced in their rejection as a basis for independent armed intervention.⁸

It has been authoritatively said that the exceptional circumstances stipulated in article 51 are "clear, objective, easy to prove and difficult to misinterpret or to fabricate."⁹ The wording was deliberately and carefully chosen.^{10 11}

Hence article 51 can under no circumstances afford a justification for U.S. intervention in Vietnam, since the Saigon regime is indisputably not a member of the United Nations and, indeed, under the Geneva Accords of 1954, South Vietnam is merely a temporary zone not even qualifying politically as a state (See Section II *infra*), even if it be assumed that an "armed attack,"

⁵ In support of his views, Professor Jessup noted:

"The documentary record of the discussions at San Francisco does not afford conclusive evidence that the suggested interpretation of the words 'armed attack' in Article 51 is correct, but the general tenor of the discussions, as well as the careful choice of words throughout Chapters VI and VII of the Charter relative to various stages of aggravation of dangers to the peace, support the view stated." (Jessup, "A Modern Law of Nations," p. 166.)

⁶ See, Louis Henkin (Professor of Law and International Law and Diplomacy, Columbia University), 57 "American Society of International Law Proceedings," 1963, at p. 152, Moore's "Digest of International Law," vol. II, p. 412.

⁷ Henkin, *ibid*.

⁸ Hearings on U.N. Charter, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong., 1st sess., July 9-13, 1945, at p. 210.

⁹ Henkin, *ibid*.

^{10 11} * * * at the Conference itself, every word, every sentence, every paragraph of the Charter's text was examined and reconsidered by the representatives of 50 nations and much of it reworked." (Report to the President on the results of the San Francisco Conference [by the Chairman of the U.S. Delegation, i.e., the Secretary of State, June 26, 1945], hearings on U.N. Charter, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong., 1st sess., at p. 41.)

within the meaning of article 51, has occurred against South Vietnam. For, as has been shown, article 51 is operative only in the event of "an armed attack against a member of the United Nations." Hence, neither the right of individual self-defense nor the right of collective "self-defense can become operative.

It has been claimed that United States intervention in Vietnam is sanctioned under article 51 on the ground (1) that South Vietnam is an independent state; (2) that South Vietnam had been the victim of an armed attack from North Vietnam and (3) that the United States, with the consent of South Vietnam, was engaging in "collective self-defense" of that country, as claimed by the United States in a communication to the United Nations Security Council in March, 1965 (U.N. Chronicle, vol. 2, p. 22). To sustain this claim, all three elements must be satisfied.

This claim is untenable, however, on several grounds. First, South Vietnam was not recognized as an independent state at the 1954 Geneva Conference (see sec. II, *infra*). Even if it had become a de facto state in the course of events since 1954, the infiltration from North Vietnam cannot be deemed to constitute an "armed attack" within the purview of article 51.

Since the Geneva Accords recognized all of Vietnam as a single state, the conflict whether of the Vietcong or Ho Chi Minh against South Vietnam is "civil strife" and foreign intervention is forbidden, because civil strife is a domestic question—a position insisted upon by the United States in its Civil War of 1861. Ho Chi Minh can compare his position in demanding union of Vietnam with that of Lincoln, when Britain and France were threatening to intervene to assure the independence of the Confederacy (and with the added point that the national elections mandated for 1956 in the Geneva Accords were frustrated by South Vietnam with apparent support of the United States; see sec. II, *infra*). Nor should it be overlooked that Lincoln had very little support from the people of the South, who generally supported the Confederacy, while Ho Chi Minh has a great deal of support from the people in South Vietnam organized in the National Liberation Front whose military arm is the Vietcong. There is, therefore, a basic issue whether the hostilities in Vietnam constitute external aggression (by North Vietnam) or "civil strife." Here it should be noted that the United Nations is authorized to intervene where civil strife threatens international peace, as the United Nations did in the Congo, in accord with article 39 of the charter—but individual states are not permitted to intervene unilaterally.

The third element requisite for the invocation of the right of collective self-defense under Article 51 presupposes that the nations invoking such right are properly members of a regional collective system within the purview of the United Nations Charter. The point here involved is: Can the United States validly be a genuine member of a regional system covering southeast Asia? Article 51 and Article 53, dealing with regional systems, were interrelated amendatory provisions intended primarily to integrate the inter-American system with the United Nations organization (see fn. 8, 13, 15). The concept that the United States—a country separated by oceans and thousands of miles from southeast Asia and bereft of any historical or ethnic connection with the peoples of southeast Asia—could validly be considered a member of a regional system implanted in southeast Asia is utterly alien to the regional systems envisaged in the charter. The "Southeast Asia Collec-

tive Defense Treaty"—connecting the United States with southeast Asia, architected by Secretary of State Dulles, is a legalistic artificial formulation to circumvent the fundamental limitations placed by the United Nations Charter on unilateral actions by individual members. However ingenious—or disingenuous—the Dulles approach, SEATO is a caricature of the genuine regional systems envisaged by the U.N. Charter. A buffalo cannot be transformed into a giraffe however elongated its neck may be stretched. The Dulles approach to collective defense treaties employed legal artifice to circumvent the exclusive authority vested in the United Nations to deal with breaches in the peace. Articles 51 and 53 were intended to make a bona fide integration of regional systems of cooperation with the world system of international security—but these envisaged regional systems which historically and geographically developed into a regional community—not contemplating a regional system which fused a region like southeast Asia with a country on the North American Continent. SEATO is not a regional agency within the letter or spirit of the U.N. Charter as to authorize the United States to claim the right of collective self-defense even if there had been an armed attack on a member of the United Nations geographically located in southeast Asia. If artifices like SEATO were sanctioned, the path would be open for the emasculation of the United Nations organization and the world system of international security assiduously developed to prevent the scourge of war.

Hence article 51 cannot be properly invoked for (1) South Vietnam does not have the political status of a state; (2) even if South Vietnam were deemed a de facto state, the infiltrations do not constitute an "armed attack" within the purview of article 51; and (3) the United States cannot claim the right of "collective self-defense" in respect of a regional system involving southeast Asia.

Apart from article 51 (inapplicable to the situation here), the only other exception to the renunciation of the "threat or use of force" by member states is found in chapter VIII of the charter dealing with regional arrangements. Article 53 of said chapter contains two paragraphs of particular significance:

(a) "The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against an enemy state, as defined in paragraph 2 of this article." (Ch. VII, art. 53(1)).

Paragraph two of that article provides:

(b) "The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of this article applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present charter."

With respect to regional arrangements therefore, it is clear that no enforcement action may be undertaken without the authorization of the Security Council of the United Nations, save and except in only one instance; against any state which, during World War II, was an enemy of any of the charter,¹³ to wit, Germany, Italy and Japan. Since Vietnam was manifestly not an "enemy state" within the purview of article 53(b), enforcement action under SEATO is unau-

¹³The reason for this exception appears clear. When the charter was signed in San Francisco on June 26, 1945, peace treaties had not yet been finally signed by the allied nations with each of the enemy states. Reparations, sanctions, territorial changes, had

thorized and cannot be justified in view of the express restrictions set out under article 53(a) of the United Nations Charter.

In summary, the United Nations Charter obligates all of its signatory members to refrain from the threat or use of force, and only the Security Council (apart from the residual authority (see footnote 4) granted the General Assembly under the "uniting for peace" resolution) is authorized to determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and to determine the measures to be taken to maintain or restore international peace. To these salient provisions, there are only two exceptions: the first, the right to self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations; and, the second, the right of nations to enter into appropriate "regional arrangements," subject, however, to the provision that no enforcement action shall be taken under such arrangements without the authorization of the Security Council, the only exception to the latter requirement being with respect to measures against an enemy state, as defined in the charter.

We have shown that none of the aforementioned exceptions can be invoked by the U.S. Government with respect to its conduct in Vietnam. It follows therefore that the fundamental requirements of the United Nations Charter with respect to the renunciation of force and the threat of force are directly applicable to the actions of the United States.

One other noteworthy charter provision is article 103 which subordinates all regional and treaty compacts to the United Nations Charter.

"In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the members of the United Nations under the present charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present charter shall prevail." (Ch. XVI, art. 103).

This supremacy clause was drafted to meet the predictable reassertion of dominance by the great powers within their respective geographic zones or hemispheres. Because of the unhappy history of a world fragmented by such "spheres of influence," the supremacy clause and the restrictions on the use of force under regional agreements emerge as limitations upon the superpowers even within their own geographic zones. It is significant that the United States not only accepted these limitations, but actively supported their incorporation within the charter.¹³

not then been finalized. And so, in order to permit necessary flexibility in these respects, this sharply limited exception, permitting action against an enemy state in World War II by an allied government, was spelled out.

¹³Hearings on U.N. Charter, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong. 1st sess., supra, n. 6, at p. 306.

On May 15, 1945, Secretary of State Stettinius issued a statement at the San Francisco Conference regarding the Act of Chapultepec vis-a-vis the United Nations organization which declared (so far as here pertinent); Hearings on U.N. Charter, op. cit., p. 306;

"As a result of discussions with a number of interested delegations, proposals will be made to clarify in the charter the relationship of regional agencies and collective arrangements to the world organization.

"These proposals will—

"1. Recognize the paramount authority of the world organization in all enforcement action.

"2. Recognize that the inherent right of self-defense, either individual or collective,

¹⁴Supra.

Article 103 makes clear that the obligations of the United Nations Charter prevail vis-à-vis the obligations of the SEATO treaty. Indeed, article VI of the SEATO expressly recognizes the supremacy of the United Nations Charter (see sec. II, *infra*). Moreover the frequent citation by President Johnson of the pledges given by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and himself to aid South Vietnam afford no justification for U.S. intervention in Vietnam.¹⁴ In the first place, these pledges or commitments do not even have the status of treaties, for these Presidential pledges have not been ratified by the Senate. And even if these Presidential pledges had been solemnly ratified by the Senate, any obligations thereunder must yield to the obligations imposed under the United Nations Charter by virtue of the supremacy clause embodied in article 103.

remains unimpaired in case the Security Council does not maintain international peace and security and an armed attack against a member state occurs. Any measures of self-defense shall immediately be reported to the Security Council and shall in no way affect the authority and responsibility of the Council under the charter to take at any time such action as it may deem necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

"3. Make more clear that regional agencies will be looked to as an important way of settling local disputes by peaceful means."

The first point is already dealt with by the provision of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals (ch. VIII, sec. C, par. 2) which provides that no enforcement action will be taken by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council. It is not proposed to change this language.

The second point will be dealt with by an addition to chapter VIII of a new section substantially as follows:

"Nothing in this chapter impairs the inherent right of self-defense, either individual or collective, in the event that the Security Council does not maintain international peace and security and an armed attack against a member state occurs. Measures taken in the exercise of this right shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under this charter to take at any time such action as it may deem necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

The third point would be dealt with by inclusion of a specific reference to regional agencies or arrangements in chapter VIII, sec. A, par. 3, describing the methods whereby parties to a dispute should, first of all, seek a peaceful solution by means of their own choice.

The United States delegation believes that proposals as above outlined if adopted by the Conference would, with the other relevant provisions of the projected charter, make possible a useful and effective integration of regional systems of cooperation with the world system of international security.

This applies with particular significance to the long established inter-American system.

¹⁴ President Johnson, in his news conference of July 28, 1965, declared:

"Moreover, we are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American Nation. Three Presidents—President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and your present President—over 11 years have committed themselves and have promised to help defend this small and valiant nation" (Presidential Documents, vol. 1, No. 1, p. 15). President Eisenhower has stated that his administration had made no commitment to South Vietnam "in terms of military support on programs whatsoever" (the New York Times, Aug. 18, 1965, p. 1).

Nor would the illegality of U.S. intervention in Vietnam be altered by the circumstance that the Saigon regime may have invited the United States to assume its role in the Vietnam conflict. The supremacy clause of the charter manifestly prevails and cannot be annulled by mutual agreement of third parties.

It is by virtue of the supremacy clause that the Secretary General of the United Nations has called the world's attention to the emasculation of the authority of the United Nations resulting from actions taken by regional agencies without reference to the Security Council.

We believe that any fair study of the United Nations Charter will affirm the observations of Prof. Lewis Henkin, of Columbia University, when he speaks "of the law of the charter":

"So far as it purports to prescribe for the conduct of nations, it consists, basically, of one principle: Except in self-defense against armed attack, members must refrain from the threat or use of force against other states * * * the rule of the charter against unilateral force in international relations is the essence of any meaningful concept of law between nations and the foundation on which rests all other attempts to regulate international behavior. It is a rule which all nations have accepted and which all have a common interest essential to law."¹⁵

It appears difficult to escape the conclusion therefore, in the light of the aforesaid, that the action of the U.S. Government in Vietnam contravenes essential provisions of the United Nations Charter. The U.S. Government has decided for itself to use armed forces in South Vietnam and to bomb North Vietnam without authorization of the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations. The failure of the United States to honor its obligations under the United Nations Charter is a regrettable but inescapable conclusion which we as lawyers have been compelled to reach. We, as lawyers, urge our President to accept the obligations for international behavior placed upon us by our signature of the United Nations Charter.

II. The United States in Vietnam: The 1954 Geneva Accords and the SEATO Treaty

Officials of the U.S. Government have nevertheless asserted, on different occasions, that the actions of the United States in Vietnam are consistent with the U.S. duties and obligations under the United Nations Charter and sanctioned by the treaty creating the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO).¹⁶ The conduct of the U.S. Government has been justified as support of a legitimate government defending itself against insurrection from within and aggres-

¹⁵ Henkin, in 57 "American Society of International Law Proceedings," 1963, supra, n. 6, at p. 148. See also in further explication of Professor Henkin's succinct conclusion: Statements of Hon. Edward R. Steytinius, Jr., Secretary of State, the testimony of Senator Millikin, and the testimony of Mr. Pasvolksy, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for International Organization and Security Affairs, in hearings on U.N. Charter, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong., 1st sess., supra, n. 8, at pp. 34-147, 210, 95-100 and 304-307; Jessup, "A Modern Law of Nations" (1947); Proclamation of Athens and Declaration of General Principles for a World Rule of Law, adopted by the First World Conference on World Peace Through Law, Athens, Greece, July 6, 1963; Francis T. P. Pimpton, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, State Department Bulletin, vol. XLIX, No. 1278, Dec. 23, 1963, pp. 978-979.

¹⁶ Geneva Conf. Doc. No. IC/42/Rev. 2, in 1 "American Foreign Policy"; 1960-55 Basic Documents 750; New York Times, July 24, 1954, p. 4.

sion from without. We have demonstrated above that even if this latter position were accepted on its face, unilateral conclusions and actions taken by the Government of the United States upon the basis of such conclusions are violative of the firm obligations under the United Nations Charter. However, we do not let the matter rest with this assertion, but proceed to an examination of the validity of the claims made by the U.S. Government in support of its conduct in Vietnam.

The Geneva agreement under which the war between Vietnam and the French was terminated, effected the division of Vietnam into north and south, at the 17th parallel. The said "agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam," entered into in Geneva on July 20, 1954, provided that the division of Vietnam at the 17th parallel was only "a provisional military demarcation line" on either side of which the opposing forces could be "regrouped"—"the forces of the Peoples Army of Vietnam to the north of the line and the forces of the French Union to the south" (ch. I, art. 1).¹⁷

The Geneva agreement makes plain that the division of the 17th parallel was to be temporary and a step in the preparation for a general election to elect a government for a unified nation. Pending such election, "civil administration in each regrouping zone [was to] be in the hands of the party whose forces are to be regrouped there" [art. 14(a)].

The day after the aforesaid cease-fire agreement was entered into, representatives of Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (Vietminh), Laos, France, the Peoples Republic of China, the U.S.S.R., and the United Kingdom affirmed The Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference on the Problems of Restoring Peace in Indochina, July 21, 1954.¹⁸ The declaration emphasized that the north-south division was solely a means of ending the military conflict and not the creation of any political or territorial boundary. Article 6 of the declaration stated:

"The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Vietnam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and shall not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary."

¹⁷ It is relevant to note that at the time this provision was agreed upon, the Vietminh occupied all but a few "islands" of territory to the north of the 17th parallel as well as approximately two-thirds of the territory south of that line. See map showing areas of South Vietnam under Vietminh control at end of May 1953 in Henri Navarre, "Agonie de L'Indo-Chine" (1953-54) (Paris, 1956) p. 37. Thus, by the cease-fire agreement the Vietminh gave up substantial areas of territory in what is now called South Vietnam.

An article in the New Republic, May 22, 1965, p. 29, by the Honorable Henry W. Edgerton, senior circuit judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, brilliantly delineates the provisional character of the "Government" of South Vietnam and casts doubt on the juridical claim to the existence of that government.

¹⁸ See "Further Documents Relating to the Discussion of Indo-China at the Geneva Conference" June 16-July 21, 1954 (London) (Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Cmd 9239), 1954 (referred to as "Geneva Accords"). The French-sponsored Bao Dai regime, which was not endowed as yet with any real political substance, did not sign the Geneva accord; not until 1956 did France relinquish control over South Vietnam; the Republic of Vietnam was proclaimed on Oct. 26, 1955, but French troops were not completely evacuated from the country until Nov. 1, 1956.

This constitutes a recognition of the historical fact that Vietnam is a single nation, divided into two zones only temporarily for administrative purposes pending an election. This being so, the action of the North Vietnamese in aiding the South Vietnamese, to the extent that it has taken place, neither affects the character of the war as a civil war nor constitutes foreign intervention. It cannot be considered an armed attack by one nation on another.

The United States is in fact a foreign nation vis-a-vis Vietnam; North Vietnam is not. The latter by the Geneva agreement was to participate in an election not to determine whether North and South Vietnam should be united, but to select a government of the nation of Vietnam, constituting all of Vietnam—north, south, east, and west. It was the refusal on the part of the Diem regime and the subsequent "governments" of the south, supported by the United States, to participate in such elections that opened the door to the present conflict.

It was also stated in the declaration that the clear objective of settling political problems and unifying the nation was to be by means of free general elections. Article 7 of the declaration provided:

"The Conference declares that so far as Vietnam is concerned, the settlement of political problems effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity, shall permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot. In order to insure that sufficient progress in the restoration of peace has been made, and that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will, national elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission."¹⁹

The reference to "national elections" reinforces the evidence of the historical status of Vietnam as a single nation. To present the picture, as the United States repeatedly has done, as though North Vietnam were an interloper having no organic relationship to South Vietnam is to ignore both the applicable legal principles and treaties and the facts of history.

Although the United States participated in the discussion leading up to the Geneva Accords, it did not sign the final declaration. Instead, the U.S. Government, through its Under Secretary of State, Walter Bedell Smith, made its own unilateral declaration²⁰ on July 21, 1954. In this declaration, the United States took note of the Geneva agreements and declared that the United States would "refrain from threat or the use of force to disturb them, in accordance with article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligation of members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force."

Referring to free elections in Vietnam, the United States declaration stated:

"In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through elections super-

¹⁹Note that article 7 stipulates that the elections were to be antecedent to and a necessary condition for the "fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions" and that the elections were to be held "in order to insure * * * that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will." This particular portion of the Geneva Accord has frequently been quoted out of context, with the key phrases in reverse order, in order to justify the refusal to hold elections on the grounds that the necessary conditions did not exist.

²⁰See "Extracts From Verbatim Records of Eighth Plenary Session," Geneva Accords.

vised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly."²¹

Thus the United States recognized the fact that Vietnam was a single nation. Nevertheless the justification of United States policy today ignores this admitted fact. The United States persists in its denial that it is intervening in a civil war. It seeks to justify the bombing of North Vietnam by the United States on the basis that North Vietnam is a foreign aggressor in South Vietnam.

Nor is this all. The United States further pledged "that it will not join in any arrangement which will hinder" the reunification of Vietnam, and concluded with the hope that:

"The agreement will permit Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam to play their part, in full independence and sovereignty in the peaceful community of nations, and will enable the peoples of the area to determine their own future."

No election was ever held pursuant to the Geneva Accords, although both the International Control Commission (composed of India, Poland, and Canada) and the United Nations announced readiness to supervise such elections. South Vietnam announced that it did not regard itself obliged to take part in the elections because the participation of North Vietnam would render such elections not free, a position apparently supported by the State Department.²² In 1955, following the Geneva Accords, then Prime Minister of State Diem repudiated the Geneva agreements and refused to hold the elections. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his memoirs, suggests a further reason for Diem's refusal to hold elections pursuant to the Geneva Accords:

"I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indo Chinese affairs who did not agree that had elections been held at the time of the fighting possibly 80 percent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader rather than Chief of State Bao Dai."²³

The consequences of the repudiation of the Geneva Accords were delineated by Senator ERNEST GRUENING in a speech to the Senate on April 9, 1965:

"Nowhere in its own declaration did the United States recognize the political partition of Vietnam; insofar as it referred to the country, it designated it as "Vietnam," not "South Vietnam" and "North Vietnam."

²²See, Question No. 7, "Questions and Answers on Vietnam," Department of State publication No. 7724, August 1964, p. 8. See also footnote 19, George McT. Kahin and John W. Lewis, professors of government at Cornell University, in their article, "The United States in Vietnam," which appeared in the June 1965 issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, note (op. cit. p. 31):

"When on July 16, 1955, the Diem government announced, with American backing, that it would defy the provision calling for national elections, it violated a central condition which had made the Geneva Accords acceptable to the Vietminh. Regardless of what sophistry has been employed to demonstrate otherwise, in encouraging this move the United States departed from the position taken in its own unilateral declaration. And France in acquiescing abandoned the responsibility which she had unequivocally accepted a year earlier."

(Citing—Allan B. Cole, ed., "Conflict in Indo-China and International Repercussions," a documentary history, 1945-1955 (Ithaca, N.Y.) 1956, pp. 226-228; and Donald Lancaster, "The Emancipation of French Indo-China" (Oxford, 1961), pp. 370-372.)

²³Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Mandate for Change: The White House Years, 1953-1956" (London, 1963), p. 372.

"That civil war began—let me repeat, because this is crucial to the issue—when the Diem regime—at our urging—refused to carry out the provision contained in the Geneva Agreement of 1954 to hold elections for the reunification of Vietnam. That was one of the underlying conditions of the Geneva agreement. The civil war began and has continued with intensified fury ever since * * *. For over 800 years, before its conquest by France, Vietnam was a united country. After defeating the French in 1954, the Vietnamese went to the conference table at Geneva, agreeing to a settlement only on condition that reunification elections be held. Yet, nowhere in President Johnson's speech of April 7, 1965, at Johns Hopkins University is there held out a hope of ultimate reunification of Vietnam. He conditioned the ultimate peace 'upon and independent South Vietnam instead'."

In view of all of the aforesaid, the assumptions and justifications for our governmental policy in Vietnam do not appear to have support, either in law or in fact. The conduct of the U.S. Government in Vietnam appears plainly to violate the terms of the Geneva Accords and to repudiate solemn pledges to "refrain from the threat or the use of force" to disturb the Geneva Accords.

Moreover, nothing in the provisions of the southeast Asian Collective Defense Treaty would appear to justify the conduct of the U.S. Government in Vietnam. The SEATO Treaty was signed in Manila some 7 weeks after the signing of the Geneva Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam. The SEATO Treaty became effective in February 1955, following the treaty ratification by eight member states—the United States, France, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan, and the Philippine Islands.

By the preamble and by Article I of the SEATO Treaty, the parties acceded to the principles and supremacy of the United Nations Charter in accordance with article 103 thereof, which it will be recalled, provides as follows:

"In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the members of the United Nations under the present charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present charter shall prevail."

The supremacy of this provision was expressly reiterated by the eight SEATO nations under article VI of said treaty, in which each solemnly agreed that the SEATO Treaty:

"* * * does not affect the rights and obligations of any of the parties under the Charter of the United Nations, or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The key provisions of the SEATO Treaty are to be found in article IV. Paragraph 1 thereof permits the use of force by one or more member states only in the event of "aggression by means of armed attack." But where the integrity or inviolability of any territory covered by the treaty is threatened "by other than armed attack" or "by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area," then, paragraph 2 of article IV requires, as a prerequisite to intervention, that "the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures to be taken. * * *"

The consent of all eight SEATO nations was originally required before any military action under article IV could be undertaken by any of them (New York Times, May 28, 1962). Later, this rule was modified so that action could be undertaken if there was no dissenting vote—i.e., an abstention would not count as a veto (New York Times, April 19, 1964). At the last two annual meetings of the Ministerial Council of SEATO, France

has refused to support a communique pledging SEATO backing for South Vietnam against the Vietcong (New York Times, April 15-16, 1964; May 3-6, 1965; see also, Los Angeles Times, May 3-4, 1965). It would appear that with the threat of a French veto a formal SEATO commitment in Vietnam has not been sought by the United States. However, even if there had been unanimity among the SEATO nations, the provisions of article 53 of chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter will still prevail:

"But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council. * * *

Manifestly, no such authorization has ever been conferred, either by the Security Council of the United Nations, or by the General Assembly, from which it follows that American action in Vietnam clearly cannot be supported by reference to SEATO.

So long as the United States remains a member of the United Nations, our right to intervene is circumscribed by the provisions of the United Nations Charter. As members of SEATO, our right to intervene is limited, both by the requirement for unanimity among all of the eight treaty nations and, in addition, by the superseding requirement of article 53 of chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, prohibiting any enforcement action under a regional arrangement without the authority of the Security Council. Our justification for acting contrary to our solemn obligations under the United Nations Charter appears tenuous and insubstantial. The fact of the matter is that the U.S. Government has simply acted as its own judge of its own interests in patent disregard of the fundamental law embodied in the United Nations Charter.

III. Constitutional aspects of United States intervention in Vietnam

This disregard of the rules of the charter, inherent in U.S. intervention in Vietnam, is compounded by the fact that such intervention is also violative of our own Constitution. Whatever doubts may have existed prior to the President's "Report to the Nation Following a Review of U.S. Policy in Vietnam"²⁴ (set out at his news conference on July 28, 1965), as to whether U.S. action in Vietnam constituted the conduct of a war, the President in that report made it explicitly clear that "this is really war," noting that "our fighting strength" was being raised from 75,000 to 125,000 "almost immediately" and that "additional forces will be needed later, and they will be sent as requested." Can the President's conduct be squared with our Constitution (apart from the obligations imposed upon member states by the United Nations Charter)?

It is the genius of our constitutional system that ours is a government of checks and balances. A dangerous concentration of power is avoided by the separation—in Articles I, II, and III of the Constitution—of the legislative, executive, and judicial powers. The doctrine of "separation of powers" is fundamental to, and is one of the "great structural principles of the American constitutional system."²⁵ The Supreme Court has recently characterized this "separation of powers" as "a bulwark against tyranny." *United States v. Brown*, — U.S. —, 33 Law Week 4603 (June 7, 1965). The Supreme Court had earlier said:

"The power to make the necessary laws is in Congress; the power to execute in the

²⁴ Presidential Documents, vol. 1, No. 1 (Aug. 2, 1965), pp. 15-19. See also State Department bulletin, April 26, 1965, p. 606; State Department bulletin, May 24, 1965, passim; State Department bulletin, May 31, 1965, p. 838, Krock, "By Any Other Name, It's Still War," New York Times, June 10, 1965.

²⁵ Corwin, "The President: Office and Powers" (New York, 1957), p. 9.

President. Both powers imply many subordinate powers. Each includes all authority essential to its due exercise. But neither can the President, in war more than in peace, intrude upon the proper authority of Congress, nor Congress upon the proper authority of the President." Ex parte Milligan, 4 Wall 2, 139 (1866).

Classically stated by Blackstone²⁶ and derived from Plato, Aristotle, Polybius, Cicero, Machiavelli, Harrington, Locke, and Montesquieu,²⁷ this constitutional separation of powers was deliberately carried over by the Framers into the conduct of foreign affairs. For, contrary to widely held assumptions, the power to make and conduct foreign policy is not vested exclusively in the President, but is divided between him and Congress, with each endowed with complementary, but separate²⁸ powers and responsibilities.²⁹

Thus, in making and carrying out general foreign policy, Article II, Section 2 requires the President to have the "Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." And the President also requires the advice and consent of the Senate to "appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls."

When statecraft fails and the question becomes the ultimate one of war or peace, the Constitution imposes a tight rein upon the President. His participation ends at the threshold of the decision whether or not to declare war. Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 11, that power is confided exclusively to the Congress.³⁰ There is no mention of the President in connection with the power to "declare war." Under the Constitution, Congress alone must make this decision. The Clause does not read "on recommendation of the President," nor that the "President with advice and consent of Congress may declare war." As former Assistant Secretary of State James Grafton Rogers has observed "The omission is significant. There was to be no war unless Congress took the initiative." Rogers, "World Policing and The Constitution," p. 21 (Boston, 1945).

"Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of war is entrusted only to Congress." *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 642 (1952) (Jackson, J.).

That the President lacks constitutional power to make war is underscored by the historic statement made by President Wood-

²⁶ Blackstone, "Commentaries on the Law of England," 146 (7th ed. 1775).

²⁷ Cf., Sharp, "The Classical American Doctrine of 'Separation of Powers'," 2 U. of Chi. L. Rev. 385 (1935).

²⁸ "One of the most striking facts in the institutional philosophic history of the United States (is) that the legislative-executive quarrels during the colonial period convinced the colonists of the desirability of a separation of powers rather than a union of powers." Wright "Consensus and Continuity," p. 17 (Boston, 1958).

"The doctrine of separated powers is implemented by a number of constitutional provisions, some of which entrust certain jobs exclusively to certain branches, while others say that a given task is not to be performed by a given branch." *United States v. Brown, supra*—U.S. at p. —, 33 Law Week, at p. 4605.

²⁹ Story, "Commentaries on the Constitution" (Boston, 1833), passim, Dahl, "Congress and Foreign Policy" (New Haven, Conn., 1950); Robinson, "Congress and Foreign Policy-Making: A Study in Legislative Influence and Initiative" (Ill., 1962).

³⁰ Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution reads:

"The Congress shall have the power:

* * * * *
 "1. To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

row Wilson on the night of April 2, 1917 when he addressed the Congress in a joint session:

"I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making."³¹

President Franklin Roosevelt also heeded his constitutional responsibilities and was also mindful and sensitive of the constitutional limitations applicable to the President when, before a joint session of the Congress on December 7, 1941, he requested the Congress for a declaration of war following Pearl Harbor.

The decision to place the responsibility for declaring war exclusively in Congress as the direct representative of the people, and not even to provide for the President's participation in that decision was a most deliberate one by the Framers.

The Constitutional Convention had been urged to rest the power to declare war, the "last resort of sovereigns, ultima ratio regum," in the executive, or, alternatively, in the Senate. 3 Story, "Commentaries on the Constitution," par. 1166. The arguments were made that "large bodies necessarily move slowly" and "despatch, secrecy, and vigor are often indispensable, and always useful towards success." Story, *ibid*.

When the issue was debated at the Convention, Mr. Gerry stated that he "never expected to hear in a republic a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war." Madison and Gerry "moved to insert 'declare,' striking out 'make' war; leaving to the Executive the power to repeal sudden attacks." The motion carried. Farrand ed., "Records of the Federal Convention" (New Haven, 1911), II, pp. 318-319.³²

³¹ President Wilson went on to say:

"With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it; and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war."

³² The Framers concluded and provided "that the power of declaring war is not only the highest sovereign prerogative; but that it is in its own nature and effects so critical and calamitous, that it requires the utmost deliberation, and the successive review of all the councils of the nation. War, in its best estate, never fails to impose upon the people the most burdensome taxes, and personal sufferings. It is always injurious and sometimes subversive of the great commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests. Nay, it always involves the prosperity, and not infrequently the existence of a nation. It is sometimes fatal to public liberty itself, by introducing a spirit of military glory, which is ready to follow, wherever a successive commander will lead; and in a republic whose institutions are essentially founded on the basis of peace, there is infinite danger that war will find it both imbecile in defense, and eager for contest. Indeed, the history of republics has but too fatally proved, that they are too ambitious of military fame and conquest, and too easily devoted to the views of demagogues, who flatter their pride and betray their interests. It should therefore be difficult in a republic to declare war; but not to make peace." Story op. cit., § 1166.

February 9, 1966

Nowhere in the debates is there support for the view that the President can wage a war or "commit" our Nation to the waging of a war. On the contrary, warmaking was to be a purely legislative prerogative. The only use of force without a declaration of war that was contemplated as the debates clearly show, was "to repel sudden attacks."³³

These constitutional provisions that only Congress shall have the power to declare war and that Congress has the sole responsibility to raise and support the armies, to provide for a navy, and to impose the taxes to provide the funds to carry on a war, reflected a profound distrust of executive authority and a corresponding reliance upon the legislature as the instrument for the decisionmaking in this vital area. Bemis, "The Diplomacy of the American Revolution" (New York, 1935), pp. 29-35.

These provisions reflected things painfully learned during the early colonial period, when every major European war had its counterpart on the American frontiers. The Colonies were therefore determined to end the imperial authority to decide for them what wars they should enter and what the outcome of those wars should be. Savelle, "The American Balance of Power and the European Diplomacy 1713-78," in Morris ed., "The Era of the American Revolution" (New York, 1939), pp. 140-169.

The Convention was not only determined to deny warmaking power to the President, but was also unwilling to entrust it to the Senate alone. To assure the fullest consideration, the Framers therefore provided that the House of Representatives, larger and more representative than the Senate, should also be brought in to decide this vital question. The action and decision of the whole Congress were therefore constitutionally made necessary to this fateful undertaking.

"The Constitution says, therefore, in effect, 'Our country shall not be committed formally to a trial of force with another nation, our people generally summoned to the effort and all the legal consequences to people, rights and property incurred until the House, Senate and the President agree.'" Rogers, "World Policing and the Constitution" (Boston, 1945), p. 35.

Concededly there have been many instances when the President has sent U.S. Armed Forces abroad without a declaration of war by Congress.³⁴ These have ranged from engagements between pirates and American ships on the high seas to the dispatch of our Armed Forces to Latin American countries.

These precedents cannot justify the present actions without bringing to mind Swift's comment on "precedents" in Gulliver's Travels:

"It is a maxim among these lawyers, that whatever hath been done before, may legally be done again; and therefore they take special care to record all the decisions formerly made against common justice and the general reason of mankind. These, under the name of precedents, they produce as authorities to justify the most iniquitous opinions; and the judges never fail to directing accordingly."

Here it is important to distinguish our country's involvement in the Korean war. For the United States fought under the aegis

³³ Manifestly the residuary power left to the President—"to repel sudden attack" contemplated attacks on the country's geographical territory—not "sudden attacks" in far-off lands, such as southeast Asia. Cf. Tonkin Bay Joint Resolution of Aug. 6-7, 1964, discussed in section IV, infra.

³⁴ See U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Committee on Armed Services, hearing, "Situation in Cuba," 87th Cong., 2d sess., Sept. 17, 1962 (Washington, G.P.O., 1962), pp. 82-87; Rogers, op. cit., especially pp. 93-123.

of the United Nations pursuant to a definitive resolution of the Security Council authorizing and directing the employment of armed forces of member states, so that the United States was thus performing its solemn obligations undertaken in becoming a signatory of the United Nations Charter, a treaty which is the "supreme law of the land." But in the Vietnamese situation, there has been no authorization by the Security Council; indeed the Security Council has not even been seized of the matter, has not been requested to entertain jurisdiction of the present conflict.

It is therefore unfortunately vitally necessary, although trite, to recall that "the Government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men." *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cr. 137 (1803). Under a government of laws, the President is not free from the checks of the Constitution of the United States; the President is not free to assume the powers entrusted solely to the Congress. Ours is not a government of executive supremacy.³⁵

Here it is fitting to recall that on May 6, 1954, at a time when the fall of Dien Bien Phu was imminent, then Senator Lyndon Johnson, as Democratic leader of the Senate, at a Jefferson-Jackson dinner, criticized the Eisenhower administration in these terms:

"We will insist upon clear explanations of the policies in which we are asked to cooperate. We will insist that we and the American people be treated as adults—that we have the facts without sugar coating.

"The function of Congress is not simply to appropriate money and leave the problem of national security at that."³⁶

A New York Times survey (June 14, 1965) reports widespread "uneasiness" over the President's foreign policies; that the American academic world "is intellectually and emotionally alienated from the President, to whom it gave such strong support in the election"; that there is "increasing—and mutual—hostility between the President and many segments of the press"; that many Democratic Members of Congress are "restive and unhappy * * * over what they regard as [the President's] high-handed manner of making and carrying out decisions in foreign affairs"; that many friendly governments abroad "are apprehensive about Mr. Johnson's use of national power"; that among these views are expressions of "dismay," the unreliability of CIA and FBI reports which the President accepted, the lack of clear policy, the disregard of "principles, support, or advice."

It is therefore imperative that Congress guard zealously against any executive usurpation of its exclusive power to declare, or to decline to declare war.

President Johnson has not been unmindful of the damaging consequences inherent in the violation of the separation of powers. As recently as August 21, 1965, the President vetoed a \$1.7 billion military construction bill, calling it "repugnant to the Constitution." In a stern message to Congress, the President described certain sections of the bill as clear violations of the "separation of powers"; warned Congress to stop meddling in the prerogatives of the executive branch [New York Times, Aug. 21, 1965, p. 1]. Yet the President has not hesitated to intrude upon the exclusive power vested in Congress to declare war.

³⁵ "With all its defects, delays, and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations," Mr. Justice Jackson, concurring in *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company v. Sawyer*, supra, 343 U.S. at 655 (1952).

³⁶ Jackson, "Role and Problems of Congress With Reference to Atomic War," May 17, 1954, publication No. L 54-135, Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

iv. Congress has not declared war in Vietnam; its joint resolutions are neither a substitute for a declaration of war nor do they make President Johnson's warmaking constitutional

Congress has not declared war in Vietnam and the President does not claim that any declaration of war supports his actions in Vietnam. In fact, the President is reported to be extremely reluctant to ask Congress directly to declare war.³⁷ Instead, the President is reported (New York Times, June 19, 1965, p. 10) to believe that authority for his actions may be inferred or extracted from the Tonkin Bay joint resolution of August 6-7, 1964 (H.J. Res. 1145; Public Law 88-408, 78 Stat., 384, 88th Cong., 2d sess.), and the joint resolution of May 7, 1965 (H.J. Res. 447; Public Law 89-18; 79 Stat. 109, 89th Cong., 1st sess.), making a supplemental appropriation to the Defense Department for the Vietnam operations.

The Tonkin Bay resolution is not a declaration of war. At most, it is an ultimatum—if that. It "approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." It goes on to express the view that "the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia 'is vital' to the national interests of the United States" and declares the readiness of the United States to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed forces, to assist any member or protocol SEATO state to defend its freedom. The resolution, however, provides that all such steps shall be "consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty."

It is clear that Congressmen who voted for the Tonkin Bay joint resolution were not voting a declaration of war in Vietnam. The resolution does not mention North Vietnam nor China; indeed it does not even mention Vietnam. It was "passed in the fever of indignation that followed reported attacks by North Vietnamese torpedo boats against U.S. fleet units in Tonkin Bay." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 9, 1965, p. 12528. There is no evidence that Congress thought or understood that it was declaring war. It took no contemporaneous action which would have implemented a declaration of war. And the remarks of several Members of the House and Senate during and since the debate on the resolution reinforce the conclusion that the Tonkin Bay resolution was not regarded as a declaration of war. Congress manifestly cannot delegate to the President its exclusive power to declare war; and even under the specific terms of the Tonkin Bay resolution, the President's actions neither conform nor are consonant with the Constitution—and as we have seen in the earlier analysis, the President's actions are not consonant with the Charter of the United Nations, nor with the SEATO Treaty.

In passing the May 7, 1965, resolution, authorizing a supplemental appropriation for the Vietnam operations, Congress was confronted with a fait accompli which severely circumscribed its action. Its constitutional check on the will or errors of the Executive was by the President's message reduced to its power of the purse. Such a circumscription will not necessarily prevent unwise or unpopular decisions or allow for the exercise of the full discretion which the Constitution intended Congress to have, and for it alone to exercise. Nevertheless, a resolution authorizing an appropriation does not constitute a declaration of war, nor can it constitutionally authorize the President to wage an undeclared war.

³⁷ Wall Street Journal, June 17, 1965, "The U.S. May Become More Candid on Rising Land-War Involvement," pp. 1, 16.

The presidential assumption of powers vested exclusively in the Congress concern arrogations of power which convert republican institutions, framed for the purpose of guarding and securing the liberties of the citizen, into a government of executive supremacy. If the Constitution has such elastic, evanescent character, the provisions for its amendment are entirely useless; presidentially determined expediency would become then the standard of constitutional construction.

Under the rule of law, compliance with the forms and procedures of the law are as imperative as compliance with the substance of the law. A lynching is a totally inadequate substitute for a trial, regardless of the guilt of the victim. What Mr. Justice Frankfurter wrote in another context is equally applicable here: "The history of liberty has largely been the history of observance of procedural safeguards." *McNabb v. United States*, 318 U.S. 332, 347 (1947).

Under our system, constitutional powers must be exercised in a constitutional manner by constitutionally established institutions. Disregard of fundamentals in an area concerning the highest sovereign prerogative affecting the very lives and fortunes of its citizens in the interest of a short-term expediency undermines "constitutional morality" to such an extent that the maintenance of the order itself is endangered." Friedrich, "The Philosophy of Law in Historical Perspective," p. 216 (Chicago, 1963).

Finally, it cannot be overemphasized that even a declaration of war by the Congress would not negate the violations of our obligations assumed under the United Nations Charter or negate the violations of international law inherent in United States intervention in Vietnam.

Conclusion

A learned authority in international affairs has stated:

"Bluntly, all the rules about intervention are meaningless if every nation can decide for itself which governments are legitimate and how to characterize particular limited conflict. Unless we are prepared to continue a situation in which the legality of intervention will often depend upon which side of the fence you are on, and in which, therefore, our policy becomes one of countering force with force, we must be willing to refer questions of recognition (i.e., legitimacy of the government involved) and characterization of a disorder (i.e., whether an armed attack from abroad or a civil war) to some authority other than ourselves. The United Nations is the most likely candidate for the role."³³

The United States has not observed the letter or spirit of its treaty obligations with respect to the action taken in Vietnam. World order and peace depend on the willingness of nations to respect international law and the rights of other nations. The United Nations is a symbol of the rejection of fatal policies which led to World War II, and an acceptance by the peoples of the world of the principles of collective security, and the avoidance of war and the use of armed forces in the settlement of differences between nations. The United Nations was intended to insure the preservation of international peace, security, and justice, through rules of law, binding upon all member nations. The fundamental condition for the effective functioning of the United Nations is the observance on the part of all signatory nations of the obligations assumed under the charter. Only in this way can the awe-

some potential of a third world war be prevented.

We have concluded that the U.S. Government is in violation of its treaty obligations under the U.N. Charter. We urge upon the Government that all steps be immediately taken to undo this illegality by an immediate return to an observance of the letter and spirit of the provisions of the U.N. Charter.

This is a solemn hour in history. We have a moral obligation to history to return to the high purposes and principles of the United Nations—to honor the pledges we solemnly assumed—to settle international disputes by peaceful means—to refrain in international relations from the threat or use of force.

At this fateful hour, we do well to recall the prophetic dream of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the architect of the United Nations, who upon his return from the Yalta Conference in his last address to the Congress in March 1945, said:

"The Crimea Conference * * * ought to spell the end of the system of unilateral action, the exclusive alliances, the spheres of influence, the balances of power, and all the other expedients that have been tried for centuries—and have always failed. We propose to substitute for all these, a universal organization in which all peace-loving nations will finally have a chance to join."

Should we not, 20 years after President Roosevelt's hopeful dream—20 years after the advent of the nuclear age with the awesome potentiality of incineration of our planet and the annihilation of our civilization and the culture of millenia—should we not "spell the end of the system of unilateral action * * * that has been tried for centuries—and has always failed"?

THE UNDECLARED WAR IN VIETNAM—CONFUSION CONFOUNDED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times carries four items worthy of note and thoughtful contemplation by those who are concerned about the U.S. confused policies in the conduct of the undeclared war in Vietnam.

The first item is a penetrating editorial entitled "Questions After Honolulu" in which it is stated:

What remains essential is explicit commitment by Saigon to peace talks with the Vietcong. The people of South Vietnam have been at war for 25 years and war weariness is deep in their bones. Peace is what they want more than anything else. Until the Saigon Government faces the need to offer a prospect of peace as well as continued fighting, it will be avoiding the issue that is most likely to help it mobilize support within South Vietnam and abroad.

The second item is a critical analysis by James Reston under the title "Ships Passing in the Night," in which he discusses recent maneuverings on the peace and war fronts by the administration. He says, in part:

The critics of the administration cannot be sure they have all the facts, but they are entitled to feel that the administration is reaching its decisions in a careful, orderly, unemotional way, with some relationship between Vietnam and other world responsibilities, and this is precisely the feeling they do not have.

The third item is by C. L. Sulzberger and is entitled "Roots of Befuddlement." Mr. Sulzberger emphasizes the danger of nuclear confrontation in our continued escalation of our military involvement in southeast Asia.

The fourth item is a letter to the editor sent by George F. Thomas, professor of religious thought at Princeton University—a former Rhodes scholar—in which he rightly calls the U.S. resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam a "tragic mistake."

I ask unanimous consent that these four items from the New York Times of February 9, 1966, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1966]

QUESTIONS AFTER HONOLULU

The Honolulu Conference has followed the classic pattern of summit meetings that are hastily called without thorough preparation in advance: it has left confusion in its wake, with more questions raised than answered.

The kindest construction to be placed on President Johnson's tough opening remarks, which bitterly belabored his domestic critics, is that they were primarily intended to gain a sympathetic reception from South Vietnam's leaders for his concurrent insistence that "the search for peace must continue." But Premier Ky and General Thieu clearly were more interested in Mr. Johnson's promise to fight to victory, despite their agreement to a communique emphasizing peace efforts.

Saigon's leaders indicated that they favored stepped-up bombing of North Vietnam, which President Johnson opposes at present, and a further American military buildup in the south, on which Washington has yet to reach firm decisions. Their idea of a negotiated settlement is one that rejects all compromise.

The most critical difference—because it bears on immediate efforts in the United Nations to convene a new Geneva conference—is on the Vietcong's status in the projected peace talks. The Saigon leaders clearly opposed any negotiations with the Vietcong. Yet, just before the Honolulu meeting, Ambassador Harriman announced that the administration now is prepared to have the Vietcong participate "as an independent group who have an interest in the discussion." This was a vital concession both to the administration's critics in the United States and to the nonaligned countries at the U.N., which are seeking an acceptable formula for negotiations.

The one important area of agreement at Honolulu, apart from continuation of the military efforts, was on an expanded program of rural construction. The prospective doubling of American economic aid, however, will be futile unless it is accompanied by a veritable social revolution, including vigorous land reform. Premier Ky cast some doubt on his intentions in this field by his emphasis on moving slowly. His Minister of Rural Pacification envisages action in only 1,900 of South Vietnam's 15,000 hamlets this year.

Vice President HUMPHREY evidently has his work cut out for him in his followup visit to Saigon. Unless some way can be found to give more momentum to this effort, the new economic aid program may go down the same drain as all previous programs of this kind.

What remains essential is explicit commitment by Saigon to peace talks with the Vietcong. The people of South Vietnam have been at war for 25 years and war weariness is deep in their bones. Peace is what they want more than anything else. Until the Saigon government faces the need to offer a prospect of peace as well as continued fighting, it will be avoiding the issue that is most likely to help it mobilize support within South Vietnam and abroad.

³³ Roger Fisher, professor of law at Harvard University, "Intervention: Three Problems of Policy and Law" found in *Essays on Intervention*, a publication of the Marshon Center for Education in National Security, Ohio State University Press, pp. 19-20.

The questions raised by the Honolulu Conference must now be taken up in public discussion in the United States. The country will remain divided and uncertain unless the pertinent issues are illuminated by thorough debate.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 9, 1966]

WASHINGTON: SHIPS PASSING IN THE NIGHT
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—There is a great deal of motion on Vietnam these days, but the central figures in the action seem vaguely unrelated to one another, like ships passing in the night.

The administration's diplomacy at the United Nations was designed to arrange a peace conference at Geneva, but the administration's diplomacy at Honolulu seems to have committed the United States more completely to the Saigon Government and therefore reduced the chances of a peace conference with Vietcong representatives.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is holding open hearings in the hope of clarifying the issue in Vietnam, but the administration seems less interested in listening to the voices in the Senate Chamber than in drowning them out.

BUILDUP CONTINUES

Meanwhile, the one clear fact is that the military buildup is proceeding steadily on both sides. Present plans here call for doubling the American manpower commitment in the present calendar year, from 200,000 to 400,000, and going up to 600,000 in 1967.

President Johnson, it is understood, has not committed himself to carry through this entire program, but he is going along with this scale of reinforcement on a month-to-month basis.

Everything in the Johnson strategy seems to be done in twos—something for the hawks and something for the doves; bomb North Vietnam and go to the U.N. Security Council; step up the military forces and increase the pacification program and send HUBERT HUMPHREY to Saigon at the same time; criticize the Saigon Government in private and commit American power and prestige to it in public; assert that America cannot police the world but proclaim simultaneously that tyranny in the jungles of continental Asia is just as much America's concern as tyranny and subjugation of the peoples of Europe.

Do these policies complement one another or cancel each other out? Does half a war offensive, and half a peace offensive, excluding the enemy doing most of the fighting, add up to a whole policy or no policy? Will an American commitment to win a military victory in Vietnam and oppose tyranny almost anywhere in the world really encourage the South Vietnamese and the other allies to fight harder or will it encourage them to leave more and more of the struggle to Uncle Sam?

These are some of the questions that are still troubling Washington, especially since the recent moves by the President give some impression of impulsive improvisations inspired in part by domestic political considerations.

The appeal to the Security Council was made before there was a detailed exploration of the problem in the capitals of the members of the Security Council, and only a short time after our own and the U.N. officials were saying a debate there would merely increase the divisions.

The Honolulu conference was called on such short notice that even the normal security arrangements for a President crossing the ocean could not be made. And the Koreans, the Australians, and the New Zealanders, who also have troops in the battle, were not even invited.

The new thing here on Vietnam is not the policy but the process of deciding policy.

The administration cannot disclose all the information that leads to its decisions without helping the enemy. The critics of the administration cannot be sure they have all the facts, but they are entitled to feel that the administration is reaching its decisions in a careful, orderly unemotional way, with some relationship between Vietnam and other world responsibilities, and this is precisely the feeling they do not have.

JOHNSON'S MOOD

On the contrary, the President has recently been giving the impression that he is not following a clear strategic policy, but that he is thrashing about, rejecting peace offensives and then trying them, stopping bombing and then starting bombing, rejecting the U.N. and then appealing to the U.N., sending Vice President HUMPHREY to brief Asian leaders on the Honolulu conference which he did not attend—all in an atmosphere of restless experimentation and self-righteous condemnation of anybody who differs with him.

Even his handling of the Senate, usually so effective, has recently been clumsy and scornful. At Honolulu his public statements left the impression that all his critics were "special pleaders" who counsel "retreat," and that "only the callous or timid" could ignore the cause of the Vietnamese which is a bold statement since most of the allied world is ignoring them.

In short, he is leaving little room for the possibility that his policy may be wrong and this attitude, far from silencing his critics, is merely adding to their uneasiness.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1966]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: ROOTS OF BEFUDDLEMENT
(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—International opinion is quite as bewildered as American opinion concerning U.S. policy in Vietnam. This is as true for adversaries of the United States as for friends. Senator FULBRIGHT was referring only to Americans when he said he had never seen "such dissent, reservation, groping and concern." But he might just as well have been referring to the outer world, choosing Russia and China for a start.

The Chinese proclaim our Vietnamese policy is part of a Russo-American global conspiracy to encircle China, Moscow's friend Castro throws the ball back into China's court, likening Peiping's actions to those of "Yankee imperialism." No wonder the average American gets mixed; Uncle Sam can't win.

NUCLEAR ESCALATION

The southeast Asian conflict is the first since 1945 that contains an implicit danger of nuclear escalation—which was never a serious threat in Korea. This implicit danger adds a muddled element to political thinking on Vietnam.

Since Hiroshima many U.S. liberals and intellectuals have been increasingly reluctant to endorse Washington's diplomatic actions, especially if they are tough. Such groups have unconsciously developed a mood of appeasement especially in Asia, that contrasts with the attitude of liberals and intellectuals toward Europe before World War II.

This pattern is confused by the traditional U.S. policy conflict between "Asia first" and "Europe First" schools. Broadly speaking, American liberals have always tended to belong to the latter group. Following World War II, U.S. foreign policy focused primarily on European matters; Korea being an exception.

The "Europe First" school has never been happy about accepting risks in the East. It took dramatic aggressions like Pearl Harbor or the invasion of South Korea to produce a consensus on our foreign policy between liberal "Europe First" and conservative "Asia First" groupings. The gradual in-

tensifying of the Vietnam crisis by disguised aggression never achieved the same result.

Foreign opinion is bewildered for different reasons by American involvement in Vietnam. When the United States was firmly wedded to a "Europe First" policy is spurned General de Gaulle's request for a three-power committee, the United States, Britain, and France, to coordinate global strategy. This request, made in 1958, was never seriously pondered in Washington although De Gaulle made it clear that if no such arrangement were devised he would reduce French participation in NATO.

We have come full circle. The United States now urges its allies to help us in Vietnam but Europe, stripped of its Asian colonial possessions, is content to pursue its own version of a "Europe First" policy. Europeans want to avoid taking sides in communism's intramural dispute between Peiping and Moscow. They are more concerned with the problems or German unification than that of Vietnam; the present emotional atmosphere of the United States is not felt here.

DOUBLE SWITCH

Many Europeans, led by the French, were once extremely eager to attract Washington into Far Eastern commitments and an "Asia First" policy, a prospect then welcomed by American conservatives and opposed by liberals. But now that Washington has moved in the direction formerly desired by such Europeans, they in turn have shifted to our own previous position.

The "dissent, reservation, groping and concern" noted by FULBRIGHT can thus be detected abroad also—but for entirely different reasons. The old thing is that when American policy shifted from "Europe First" to "Asia First," those Europeans who originally wished to bring us into the East objected most.

Both the United States and Europeans who now criticize us have been on the same side of the policy fence—in fact on both sides—but at different times. Each has managed the strange feat of simultaneously reversing its positions.

AMERICAN LIBERALS

For a third of a century American liberals and intellectuals have been more inclined to endorse appeasement in Asia than in Europe. The nuclear danger in Asia has only reinforced this traditional position. But the U.S. Government has shifted the emphasis of its policy interests from West to East.

Some 20 years of hegemony in world power politics have apparently persuaded Washington that its views always represent the general interest—even when such views are switched. Trouble comes when some Americans can't get used to the switch and some foreigners can't get used to its timing.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1966]

CONTRADICTION IN U.S. POLICY

To the Editor:

The resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam urged upon President Johnson by military and other advisers is a tragic mistake. The confident belief at the time the bombing began that it would break the will of Hanoi to fight and would prevent further infiltration into South Vietnam has been proved wrong.

Visitors to North Vietnam have reported that it actually produced greater solidarity and a stronger determination to continue the war. Moreover, the pause in the bombing did not endure long enough to test adequately the willingness of Hanoi to negotiate a settlement. The resumption almost certainly destroys the possibility of such a settlement by stiffening resistance.

Above all, it will probably lead to a further escalation of the war, requiring an even greater commitment of our Armed Forces, vastly increasing the danger of war with

China, and further alienating the Soviet Union and other countries whose support we would like to have. Do those who urged the renewal of the bombing fully realize these dangers?

HOLDING CITIES AND COAST

Does the President's act in referring the case to the United Nations indicate that he is now aware of the dangers and is seeking to extricate us from a situation which threatens a world war? If so, should he not reexamine the suggestion made recently by both military and political experts that we should stop the bombing but continue to hold the cities and the coast until a settlement can be negotiated? Although this might not please the Pentagon, could anything be worse than to continue to destroy Vietnam in the process of trying to save it?

One can believe that the President is sincere in his repeated assertion that he is eager for negotiations. But there is a contradiction between our stated policy of leaving the Vietnamese free to choose their own form of government and our refusal to allow the participation of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam in the negotiations.

If we think that by sheer military might we can force a settlement on our terms, we shall only deceive ourselves, earn the undying hatred of the unhappy people of Vietnam and defeat our own purpose of checking the spread of communism in southeast Asia.

GEORGE F. THOMAS,
Professor of Religious Thought,
Princeton University,
PRINCETON, N.J., January 28, 1966.

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

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

ADMINISTRATION PLANS TO DESTROY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

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 de-

stroyed the attempt to give the Senate Committee the power it should have, has now been unleashed 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, 6 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 in the Senate. He, in doing it today, has been extremely timely, with the steps which are being taken, I am afraid, to downgrade the Small Business Administration.

I think it would not be inappropriate, at this point, to make a few remarks about an experience that the Senator from Colorado had with the Small Business Administration during the floods which afflicted the State of Colorado in 1965, during the month of June.

As everyone knows, the part played by the Small Business Administration is quite great in disaster areas. At that time, Mr. Foley, who has since been transferred to the Department of Commerce, was the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. Over a period of a month, I called Mr. Foley's office I do not know how many times, and finally, through the assistance of other people in the Government, was able to get a call back from him when he was in California. He seems to be one of the most peripatetic men in the whole administration, and that is saying a great deal. At least, I could never find him in his office, and was able to talk with him, in a period of 30 or 45 days, on only one occasion; and I had to talk with him from California that time.

The only way I could get any action or any answer out of the Small Business Administration, administered by Mr. Foley, was to go through the Office of Emergency Planning, the office directly under the President, which is charged with the planning of aid and assistance following major disasters.

If the Small Business Administration should be moved, as perhaps some people plan, to the Department of Commerce, I am afraid it might go back to this unable Administrator who was formerly the Administrator of the Small Business Administration; and if that should happen, the small businessman in this country might as well give up the thought of being able to get a fair and equal shake in the economics of this country under the legislation we have passed to help him.

These days we hear much about prosperity and unemployment. But, Mr. President, as I go throughout my own State and throughout the country, I cannot but observe that while it may be that the big businesses of this country are prosperous, or their financial records seem to indicate, one cannot walk up and down the streets of the cities of this country, whether they are big cities or small towns, and find many small businesses which are prospering—one out of a hundred, or maybe perhaps fewer.

It is time for those of us who are charged with legislative authority to start thinking seriously about what we can do to preserve the small businessmen in this country, because they are suffering in a hundred ways, under the tax yokes and other burdens and restrictions under which Congress and, more so, the regulatory agencies, have put them.

FLOOD CONTROL ALONG THE SOUTH PLATTE AND ARKANSAS RIVER BASINS IN COLORADO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point House Joint Memorial 1002 of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado, relating to the Chatfield Dam, the Narrows Dam, and others in the State of Colorado, and House Joint Memorial 1003 of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado, relating to expediting the construction of flood control and other multiple-purpose projects along the Arkansas River Basin in Colorado.

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

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1002

(Memorializing the Congress of the United States to take all action necessary to expedite the ultimate construction of flood control and other multipurpose projects along the South Platte River Basin in the State of Colorado, so as to prevent a recurrence of the disastrous floods experienced by the State of Colorado in 1965

Whereas in the week beginning June 14, 1965, eastern Colorado experienced the worst natural disaster in the history of the State, principally by the flooding of the South Platte and Arkansas River Basins with a total estimated damage of \$543 million to the State and its citizens; and

Whereas as a result of the June 1965 floods, considerable public attention has been given to two proposed projects in the South Platte River Basin; namely, the Chatfield Dam and Reservoir, and the Narrows Dam and Reservoir; and

Whereas the Chatfield project has been authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers, with the feasibility study expected to be completed during the first part of 1966; and the Narrows Dam project was authorized as a unit of the Missouri River Basin project by the Federal Flood Control Acts of 1944 and 1946; and

Whereas, because of the lack of support in the 1950's by business interests and other affected persons in the project areas of the proposed Chatfield and Narrows Dams, action by the Congress and the Federal agencies involved was not continued on these projects, with the exception that a further feasibility study was authorized on the Chatfield Dam; and

Whereas the 1965 flood emphasized the fact that dams and reservoirs must be built on the South Platte River and its tributaries in order to capture floodwaters generated by exorbitant amounts of rain, and by the heavy runoff waters in the high drainage areas of Colorado which flow down tributaries to the main rivers; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has made a study and recommended the construction of the Mount Carbon Dam to be located just below Morrison, Colo., and said dam is considered necessary in order to prevent a flood disaster down the tributary Bear Creek flowing into the South Platte, which could equal the June 16, 1955, disaster; and

Whereas at the present time, business interests, civic groups, intercounty regional planners, affected individuals, and State agencies in Colorado are showing an awakened public conscience for the need of unified flood control and water conservation programs in Colorado, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board is coordinating all such efforts toward the immediate construction of the Chatfield Dam and the eventual construction of the Narrows Dam, as well

as smaller flood control projects on some of the tributaries of the South Platte River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take all action necessary in order to expedite the construction of the Chatfield Dam and Reservoir on the South Platte River by authorizing the necessary preliminary funds therefor at the current session of the Congress, and also to take such action as may be necessary to expedite necessary studies to be undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with the future construction of the Narrows Dam and Reservoir on said river; and that the Corps of Engineers be urged to take other necessary action in order to effectuate the construction of the Mount Carbon Dam; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress, by this memorial, is assured of the complete and unified cooperation of the vast majority of the citizens of eastern Colorado, the members of this general assembly, and the various State agencies involved, wholeheartedly endorsing flood control and water conservation programs in the South Platte River Basin, particularly as outlined in this memorial; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable PAT MCNAMARA, chairman of the standing Senate Committee on Public Works, to the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the standing House Committee on Public Works, and to the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

ALLEN DINES,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

EVELYN T. DAVIDSON,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

ROBERT L. KNOUS,

President of the Senate.

MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,

Secretary of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1003

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to take all action necessary to expedite the construction of flood control and other multiple-purpose projects along the Arkansas River Basin in the State of Colorado, so as to prevent a recurrence of the disastrous floods experienced by the State of Colorado in 1965

Whereas in the week beginning June 14, 1965, eastern Colorado experienced the worst natural disaster in the history of the State, principally by the flooding of the Arkansas and South Platte River basins, with a total estimated damage of \$543 million to the State and its citizens; and

Whereas two major projects which are scheduled for construction in the Arkansas River Basin would provide added flood control protection for that area, and the Corps of Engineers is also reviewing the feasibility of a system of small flood-control dams along the numerous tributaries of the Arkansas river; and

Whereas one of the major projects is the Pueblo Dam and Reservoir to be constructed approximately 6 miles west of the city of Pueblo, Colo., as a part of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, said construction to begin in September 1968; the other major project being the construction of the Trinidad Dam, which as early as 1956 was authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers, to be located on the Purgatoire River in Las Animas County; and

Whereas flood damage between the proposed dam at Pueblo and the John Martin Reservoir is presently estimated at \$708,000 annually, although the 1965 flood damage greatly exceeded said figure; and

Whereas the flood menace to the city of Trinidad can be abrogated, and the economy

of this area stabilized, if the multipurpose dam proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation is constructed above the city of Trinidad; and

Whereas the 1965 flood in Colorado emphasized the fact that dams and reservoirs must be built on the Arkansas River and its tributaries to prevent future flood damage, and at the present time there is a coordinated effort in Colorado, under the direction of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, backing the construction of the Pueblo and Trinidad Dams and Reservoirs, as well as smaller flood control projects on some of the tributaries of the Arkansas River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take all action necessary in order to expedite the construction of the Pueblo and Trinidad Dams and Reservoirs as well as smaller flood control projects on tributaries of the Arkansas River; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress, by this memorial, is assured of the complete and unified cooperation of the vast majority of the citizens of Colorado, the members of this general assembly, and the various State agencies involved, in wholeheartedly endorsing flood control and water conservation programs in the Arkansas River Basin; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable PAT MCNAMARA, chairman of the standing Senate Committee on Public Works, to the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the standing House Committee on Public Works, and to the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

ALLEN DINES,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

EVELYN T. DAVIDSON,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

ROBERT L. KNOUS,

President of the Senate.

MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,

Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. ALLOTT. With respect to the latter and perhaps to both of these memorials, Mr. President, I cannot help but say that I feel that the Corps of Engineers has far too long dragged its feet in its plans and studies for the control of the flood situation, particularly along the Platte River and its tributaries and the Arkansas River and its territory.

We have had flood plans studied and restudied for years and years. We provided additional money for the Corps of Engineers last year to escalate these studies; and after the harrowing experience the citizens of nearly all of eastern Colorado went through last year, they expect the Corps of Engineers to start escalating and accelerating their studies, and to come up with some concrete plans and proposals to avoid repetition of the disastrous floods. It is high time that this area of the country receive the attention to which it is entitled. It has been neglected, as the record will show, for many years, and we can tolerate its disregard no longer.

CRIME ON THE STREETS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an editorial by Robert L. Chase in the Rocky Mountain News dated Friday, January 28, 1966, and I have waited for this opportunity to say a few words about it. I ask unani-

village and to take all steps necessary and do all things which he believes to be necessary or expedient on our and their behalf to avoid the discontinuance of passenger service over the right-of-way of said railroad, and to cooperate with other municipalities that are or will be affected by a discontinuance of passenger service and with the interested governmental departments or agencies of the State of New York, the county of Westchester, the State of Connecticut and its affected municipalities, and it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Interstate Commerce Commission at its office in Washington, D.C., to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, to our representatives in the New York State Legislature, to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, and to Congressman OGDEN R. REID, Office of Transportation of the State of New York, Westchester County Executive Edwin G. Michaelian, County Attorney Gordon Miller, and the mayors of the cities of New Rochelle, Mount Vernon, and Rye and the villages of Pelham Manor, North Pelham, Pelham, Mamaroneck, and Port Chester, and the supervisors of the towns of Pelham, Mamaroneck, and Harrison.

Resolved, That this resolution shall take effect immediately.

Adopted by the following vote. Ayes: Mayor Ryan, Trustees Goldsmith, Merkert, and Forrest. Nays: None. Absent: Trustee Wanderer.

VIETNAM

UN

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, in yesterday's Evening Star there appeared an editorial and an article which seem to me to come close to the heart of the matter regarding the conflict in Vietnam.

The editorial sets forth the basic premise that we cannot accept the logic that "tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us—or that subjugation by an armed minority in Asia is different from subjugation by an armed minority in Europe."

The article is a column by Richard Fryklund, which details the relationship between "take and hold" and "search and destroy" operations. This column very lucidly explains a tactic that may well be the one which—over the months and years—may bring stability to Vietnam.

Mr. President, I commend the editorial and article to the attention of my colleagues and the world, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHY FIGHT IN VIETNAM?

Once again the President has tried to answer those among his critics who say they do not understand why the United States is fighting in Vietnam.

The critics will not be satisfied with the answer. For there is nothing new in it. But it is hard to know what more the President might have said in his remarks upon arriving in Honolulu.

In substance, this is what he had to say: We are fighting to determine whether aggression and terror are the way of the future—a question of the gravest importance to all other nations, large or small, who seek to walk in peace and independence. If the Communists win in Vietnam they will know they can accomplish through so-called wars of liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea—or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and

Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey—or in a free election anywhere.

At this point, Mr. Johnson, in perhaps the most significant phase of his remarks, decided to lock horns with his senatorial critics, especially those in his own party. "There are special pleaders," he said, "who counsel retreat in Vietnam. They belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope. We cannot accept their logic that tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us—or that subjugation by an armed minority in Asia is different from subjugation by an armed minority in Europe. Were we to follow their course, how many nations might fall before the aggressor? Where would our treaties be respected, our word honored, our commitment believed. * * * If we allow the Communists to win in Vietnam * * * we will have to fight again someplace else—at what cost no one knows. That is why it is vitally important to every American family that we stop the Communists in South Vietnam."

It could not have been easy for a consensus man to say these things. He knows his explanation will neither satisfy nor silence his critics. But there it is. The President has taken his stand and it will be difficult if not impossible for him to turn back. Nor is it at all likely, the critics notwithstanding, that Mr. Johnson intends to turn back if he thinks he has the support of the American people, to whom his comments were really addressed.

WASHINGTON CLOSE-UP: THE LOGIC OF TACTICS IN VIETNAM

(By Richard Fryklund)

The defensive strategy in South Vietnam remains the same year after year despite Honolulu conferences and arguments among the generals.

Given the military and political situation, there just does not seem to be any alternative to the formula—clear-and-hold plus search-and-destroy plus government-building equals, some day, victory.

This was the strategy under the Diems; it remains the strategy today, and it will be the strategy as long as the war is fought.

The terminology changes and the scale of effort changes, the weapons change and the minor tactics change, but the formula endures.

Here is the logic that dictates the decisions of all the high-level conferences, bringing retired generals ever closer together in their public arguments and bringing relative harmony to the private sessions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The enemy's strategy is the starting point. He has chosen to spread out through the countryside rather than seize section and try to expand along a clearly marked front. He has chosen, or has been forced through lack of support, to leave the cities pretty much alone.

The problem of our side, then, is to clear the countryside of guerrillas and regular army units and to restore loyal governments in the cleared areas.

Since the war became a real one in the early 1960's, the first step for the defenders has necessarily been to set up bases from which to operate. Our side has to start with secure areas where it can rest troops, guard its weapons, train soldiers and direct operations.

These secure areas now dot the entire country.

They can be as small as a special forces camp in the mountains where a few score of South Vietnamese and American soldiers have built some huts. They can be a city and a jet airfield, like Da Nang, where the Marine Corps is building its major base.

They can be carved out of the wilderness, like the 1st Cavalry Division's base at An Khe, or they can be smack in the middle of

a city, like the headquarters complexes at Saigon.

But once established, they must be protected.

So the military forces inevitably set up a perimeter defense, a permanent but ever-shifting ring of soldiers and guns around the base.

Since enemy weapons can shoot several miles, the defensive ring must be several miles out from the base. Therefore, our forces must push the enemy out of a circle a mile to 10 to 50 miles in radius, depending on the size and importance of the base, and must keep him out.

This is the start of the clear-and-hold operation.

Some of the largest battles have resulted from this effort to push the enemy away. Our side has won them all. As a result, you can measure some thousands of square miles that have been taken from the enemy and handed over to the government.

It is almost impossible to hold a perimeter without aggressive patrolling outside the ring. Without this, the enemy can gather for sudden assaults and keep the defenders too busy to do anything but survive.

How far you sweep depends on your own strength.

If you can round up a few thousand soldiers, you "patrol" right through the heart of enemy sanctuaries a hundred miles or more from the base. The objective is still to keep the enemy off balance, disorganized and tired.

These patrols are called search-and-destroy operations today. They go everywhere, but they are still sporadic and small.

But the farther and the better you do search and destroy, the farther and better you can clear and hold. Search and destroy is a leaky shield for clear and hold.

Clear and hold is then a strong shield for the final step toward victory, government building.

As base areas expand, they take in contested villages and their people. The South Vietnamese province or district governments then move in to set up new local governments. If these governments provide what the people want—a school, a clinic, a water-supply system, an honest chief, a home-guard outfit, a police force—and if the clear-and-hold operations keep Vietcong infiltration down to the level of safety provided by, say, an American slum area after dark, then the war is being won.

Depending on how hard you try to use the basic formula and how hard the enemy tries to break it up, victory approaches or recedes.

It's as simple as that.

THE RUSSIAN BID FOR MARITIME SUPREMACY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the current issue of the Reporter magazine has a most disturbing article on the rapid growth of the Soviet merchant marine and a discussion of the concentrated and successful effort of the Russians to become a major shipping power. In less than 10 years the Russians have moved from 12th to 7th place among the maritime nations. They are adding merchant tonnage at the rate of a million tons a year: at this rate, the Russians will equal the British fleet in 1980. The Russian fleet already is larger than the active American merchant fleet. In startling contrast our merchant fleet has declined sharply in size. Today the Russian fleet carries the greatest part of its foreign trade; American ships only carrying 9 percent of our exports.

As the author, Noel Mostert, points out:

Unquestionably, Russia's ultimate goal is the domination of world trade.

The immense strategic and political advantage a dominant merchant marine would give to Russia is obvious. The rapid growth of the Russian merchant marine is in shocking contrast to the continued decay and decline of American merchant shipping. This article shows the need for a sound merchant marine policy on the part of the United States—a policy that will unite government, labor, and management in a sound and practical program of rebuilding and strengthening our badly weakened merchant marine. I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Russia Bids for Ocean Supremacy" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RUSSIA BIDS FOR OCEAN SUPREMACY

(By Noel Mostert)

LONDON.—Thousands of Britons, attracted by broadcast publicity, recently flocked down to the London docks, to inspect the new 20,000-ton Soviet passenger liner *Alexander Pushkin*, built in East German shipyards. It was the ship's introduction to the Western public, which Moscow hopes will patronize her when she starts sailing between Leningrad and Montreal this spring via European ports. The sightseers found a beautifully streamlined vessel, perhaps a little more garish than her Atlantic rivals but certainly as comfortable. Caviar, needless to say, will be a featured course.

The *Alexander Pushkin's* visit was really the advance celebration of a reasonably certain fact: 1966 will be Russia's year at sea. Moscow fully expects to achieve goals that most people didn't even know the Soviets were aiming for, the principal one being international recognition of the U.S.S.R. as a major maritime power. No other country can possibly match, proportionately speaking, Moscow's creation over the last 10 years of one of the largest merchant fleets in the world. Any champagne corks that pop aboard the *Alexander Pushkin* on her maiden voyage undoubtedly will be to toast the dream of eventually having the largest.

BREAKING THE ICE

The North Atlantic venture itself represents only one of the main goals. For the first time in history, Russia will be a full and regular participant in the Western ocean's trade. Actually, the entering wedge came a year ago with a Soviet initiative that has gone largely unrecognized: sending ships to Montreal in the winter, when the St. Lawrence is frozen and to all intents and purposes closed to shipping. A couple of European shipping lines were ahead of the Soviet Union in pioneering Montreal as a year-round port. They had used small, tough vessels, but the shipping world was still skeptical when the Murmansk Arctic Steamship Line announced a service between Montreal and North Sea ports with three 7,500-ton ships that were virtually icebreakers and were manned by veterans in ice navigation.

This was merely a prelude. For example, the Russians have now entered the cruising business. A sister ship of the *Pushkin's*, the *Ivan Franko*, which entered the tourist trade last year, is now about to start a year's charter with the French vacation enterprise Club Méditerranée, to carry Frenchmen on low-cost cruises to the Mediterranean and the Caribbean. Another Russian liner will take British schoolchildren on Scandinavian cruises. Furthermore, Russia also expects to

achieve its goal this year of moving 75 percent of its foreign trade in its own vessels. It will graduate a record number of officers from national maritime academies. Hundreds of new ships will enter the Soviet merchant marine, and several new shipping services are to be started, linking Russia with countries with which it has not traded directly.

More significantly, the Russians are determined to establish in 1966 a new and closer mercantile association with European countries, particularly Great Britain, whose experience as operators of the largest merchant marine in the world they eagerly wish to share.

The Soviet credentials to the western shipping world usually arrive in the form of their eminently approachable and ebullient Minister of the Merchant Fleet, Victor Bakayev, the closest Soviet approximation to a dedicated western executive, whose great abilities have received scant appraisal in the West. Last fall he was dispatched to London to explain the purposes and intentions of the Soviet merchant marine, and the outcome was one of the more remarkable declarations of cooperation that the Russians have ever made.

For 1966, Bakayev promised the opening of a northern route for shipping from Europe to the Pacific, to be maintained by a Soviet atomic icebreaker; he approved a British request to ship metals to Iran via the Trans-Russia Canal; and he announced that Russia would join and not undermine the Atlantic shipping conferences, which the steamship lines privately form to regulate passenger and freight rates. "Russia does not want to build up her merchant navy as a sort of monopoly with certain exclusive rights," Bakayev asserted, "and so we do not propose to ignore existing international organizations for cooperation in shipping."

REFUTING MAHAN

Bakayev seems to have remarkable authority to do and say what he wishes. If there is flair in what the Russians do with their merchant marine, it undoubtedly is due to Bakayev. He more than any other man is responsible for its creation. The astonishing fact is that the job has been done mainly during the past 5 years.

In a celebrated series of lectures on naval strategy delivered at the U.S. Naval War College at Newport during the closing years of the last century, Capt. A. T. Mahan, U.S. Navy, observed the fact that " * * * Russia has little maritime commerce, at least in her own bottoms; her merchant flag is rarely seen; she * * * can in no sense be called a maritime nation."

Less than 10 years ago, Mahan's remark remained substantially true. Since then Russia has moved from 12th to 7th place among the maritime nations. It has acquired some 7 million tons of shipping, most of it modern and fast and superbly designed. This is being added to at a rate of more than a million tons annually, under a 20-year series of plans that by 1980 will provide the Soviet Union with a fleet of over 20 million tons—the equivalent of the British merchant marine of today. By that time, depending upon what the Japanese do with their own ambitious plans for mercantile expansion, and assuming that the present rate of decline of Western shipping continues, the Russians may have the largest and most modern and diversified merchant fleet afloat. Indeed, maritime authorities here in London regard this program as second only to the Soviet space successes in political significance. They have no doubt at all that the merchant fleet will be Russia's most powerful economic weapon of the future.

Unquestionably, Russia's ultimate goal is domination of world trade. But even if it fails to attain the top rank, it is sure to come pretty close to it. Moreover, its effective

power in this area both now and for the future must be assessed in the light of the fact that several of the Eastern European satellites have also built up sizable fleets and shipbuilding capacity, notably Poland and East Germany, Rumania, Bulgaria, even landlocked Hungary, and Czechoslovakia (whose flag is being increasingly seen) are also expanding rapidly. The Soviet-bloc nations now operate largely as an integrated maritime unit, pooling their shipping services with a degree of harmony that they do not always achieve in other common enterprises.

Yugoslavia, too, has an impressive shipping industry, with a variety of services throughout the world; but, while working closely with the bloc, which assigns it large shipbuilding orders, it tends to go its own way in trade just as it does politically. In the long run, however, maritime independence may be less easy to maintain than political autonomy, and Yugoslavia may join rather than fight.

The shipbuilding achievements of the bloc are impressive: the Polish yards alone have launched 2.5 million tons since the war, and nearly 500 Polish-built ships are sailing under the flags of the Soviet Union, Indonesia, Communist China, Brazil, Cuba, Switzerland, the United Arab Republic, India, and surprisingly, Britain and France. But far more interesting is the diversity of shipping services that the bloc has established.

There is scarcely a trade route where its ships don't operate. Russia itself now trades in its own bottoms with more than 60 nations. Its ships are sailing from its Baltic, Black Sea, and Far Eastern ports to all parts of Asia, Africa, the Indian Ocean, the Caribbean, South America, the Mediterranean, and, intensively, to both coasts of Canada. Its trawlers, though technically not part of the merchant fleet, are seen everywhere, off Australia, southwest Africa, Newfoundland, the Antarctic.

The examples of the bloc's combined merchant services are numerous. Polish, Czech, and Russian ships provide a joint schedule between Rumanian ports and the Middle East; Polish, East German, Czech, and Russian ships sail to West Africa from East German ports. Between Cuba and the Baltic ply Russian, East German, Czech, Polish, and Hungarian ships. Polish and East German vessels operate to a variety of African ports not included in the West African service. Polish ships also run liner services to Mexico, South America, the Indian Ocean, and the Far East. By 1970 it will be exceptional to enter any large port and not encounter several of the bloc flags.

A LEGACY OF DISTRUST

The speed and success of this Soviet-bloc merchant expansion and its ingenious insertion into the trading patterns that have been virtual Western monopolies for 500 years was scarcely noticed by the West until recently. Bedeviled by their own complicated rivalries and ruthless competition, which already have done much to undermine the power and potential of the traditional maritime powers, particularly Britain, the Western nations have begun to seriously assess the possible consequences.

Lloyd's Register of Shipping, the best known international authority, puts out annually the most detailed information available on Soviet-bloc shipping. Considerable time and effort are required to evaluate this information, since Communist statistics are not always reliable and the Soviet bloc does not report full details of its shipbuilding to Lloyd's for publication, as almost every other nation does. Nonetheless officials of Lloyd's declare their information to be a "reasonably accurate and fairly complete picture." They see the merchant fleets of the bloc as a "formidable challenge" whose aim is "to capture cargo trade held previously by British and other lines."

February 9, 1966

of humanity at the other reminds me irresistably of British political life during most of the past century * * * the old imperial and liberal Britain writ large."

That sounds like a fair, if rough estimate of our moral and intellectual condition. But statesmen must deal with today's practicalities simultaneously with theories of tomorrow. In 1966 it is just conceivable that the big initiatives will come from Russia, simply because it seems to be that nation that must make crucial choices of direction.

For us, the question that must be answered in 1966 is how to make the Vietnam war a foundation stone in the construction of an Asiatic balance of power and not a pit into which we and China slide, bringing down everyone else with us to unmeasurable grief.

CURRENT MILK SHORTAGE TEMPORARY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Washington Post recently carried an excellent article by Loren H. Osman, discussing the current milk shortage. Mr. Osman, whose reporting is of consistently high caliber, has made it clear in the article that the milk shortage is due to a number of temporary factors which can be expected to correct themselves.

Among the factors cited by Mr. Osman are:

First. A drought which cut feed supplies in Eastern States while rain damaged forages in the Midwest. Cows did not milk as well on the resulting low-protein diets.

Second. High priced beef and hogs, causing farmers to switch from milking to feeding.

Third. A labor shortage which enticed dairy farmers into higher paying industrial work.

All of these factors can be expected to change in the future. The result will be more plentiful milk. Unfortunately the result will also be additional surpluses purchased and stored at Government expense.

This is one of the reasons I have been fighting against a cut in the special milk program for schoolchildren. The program by increasing the utilization of milk and creating good drinking habits in our Nation's schoolchildren lessens the pressures on the Government's price-support program. A cut in the school milk program will simply mean that the cost of the dairy price support program will go up.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Osman article be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

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

MILK PRICES COULD RISE—WISCONSIN DAIRYLAND STRAINS TO MEET NATIONAL SHORTAGES
(By Loren H. Osman)

MILWAUKEE, Wis., February 5.—Where did all the milk go? America's dairyland, traditionally the source of a great river of milk—and mountains of surplus butter and cheese—is straining to meet demands.

Giant highway tankers, hauling 6,000 gallons each, are rolling out of the State in an endless stream. They are unloading in far-flung markets from the Carolinas, Florida and Tennessee to Arkansas, Missouri, Texas and Colorado.

Last month 300 loads of "supplemental" grade A milk left Wisconsin, three times as

many as in January 1965. The boom started last fall when deficits began cropping up in other States. It gave Wisconsin a market for nearly 120 million pounds, 50 million more than 1964.

FACTORS IN SHORTAGE

This is only a drop in the milk bucket for Wisconsin, whose 2 million cows put out nearly 19 million pounds a year. But it is part of a nationwide kink in the dairy situation being felt back at crossroads plants and which may turn up in the price of milk on the doorstep.

Among the factors behind it are these:

Drought cut feed supplies in Eastern States, while rains damaged forages in the Midwest. Last winter, 60,000 acres of Wisconsin alfalfa smothered under ice. Farmers resorted to annual grass until they could re-establish legumes. But feed quality was poor, fall rains hampered silage making and some corn froze. Cows didn't milk as well on low protein diets.

High priced beef and hogs, caused many farmers to switch from milking to feeding. Dairy herds were culled sharply to take advantage of good meat prices.

A labor shortage enticed dairy farmers into enterprises with less work or off the farm entirely—following the inducement of high factory wages. Wisconsin, which had 130,000 herds in 1952, probably is down to 80,000.

BOOST IN PRICE ASKED

Nationally, the 1965 production of 125.5 billion pounds was off a billion from 1964. The Corn Belt was down 3.6 percent. Wisconsin barely held its own but in meeting out-of-State demands, its butter production dropped 6 percent and cheesemaking skidded in the fall months.

Farm leaders have urged Agriculture Secretary Freeman to boost the support price of milk, now at \$3.24 a hundredweight for milk for manufacturing uses (75 percent of parity), to halt the exodus of dairy farmers, increase incomes, and relieve shortages.

The Government bought 26 percent less dairy products last year to prop prices than in 1964 and might be apprehensive about getting back in the butter and cheese business if boosting supports brought more surpluses. Supports are reset April 1.

Farm milk prices have improved, wound up last year at \$3.88 a hundred pounds in Wisconsin, highest since 1952. The average includes fluid markets.

Linked with the drop in milk from farms has been a bounding cheese market. Paced by more pizzas and cheese replacements for steaks and chops, consumption has climbed. At the Green Bay Cheese Exchange, cheddar is 5 cents a pound higher than a year ago, swiss up 7 cents.

OUTBID BY CHEESE PLANTS

Cheese plants have been outbidding butter factories for farmers' milk, and like everyone else's business, volume is the key to success. Some less efficient or less flexible operations have shut down entirely. Dairy leaders say realigning supports would correct the disparity between cheese and butter.

Prosperous cheesemakers have even waded away producers from normally higher fluid markets. This enabled the 22 cooperatives supplying Chicago to win an extra 30 cents a hundredweight from milk dealers last week, in a contract for the next year's supply, to put an extra \$3,500,000 into the pockets of 13,500 farmers, in premiums over Federal minimums.

Pure Milk Association, largest bargainer on the Chicago market, also has asked the Agriculture Department to tighten "pooling provisions" of country plants. These plants now need to send only 20 percent of their volume to the market to share in the marketwide averaging of dealers' paying prices, can put the rest into cheese. PMA wants the percentage raised to assure supplies.

The involved milk picture may be partly righted by pasture time. Experts predict the national supply to regain half of last year's loss, by the end of 1966. The impression will remain, however: surpluses can evaporate in a hurry.

PROPOSED CURTAILMENT OF SERVICE BY THE NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD CO.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution regarding the application of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., to discontinue all interstate passenger trains, adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Larchmont, N.Y., on January 3, 1966.

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

RESOLUTION REGARDING APPLICATION OF NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD CO. TRUSTEES TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION TO DISCONTINUE ALL INTERSTATE PASSENGER TRAINS

Whereas there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission an application by the trustees of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. to discontinue all interstate passenger trains, being Finance Docket No. 23831; and

Whereas the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad is the only direct means of public transportation between the village of Larchmont and Grand Central terminal in New York City and between the village of Larchmont and other Westchester County communities and communities located on the said railroad right-of-way in the State of Connecticut; and

Whereas the village of Larchmont is a first-class village of over 5,000 residents and a great number of its residents use said railroad daily for the purpose of transportation from Larchmont to their respective places of business in New York City; and

Whereas many residents of the village of Larchmont purchased homes in Larchmont relying on the public transportation furnished by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.; and

Whereas the discontinuance of the passenger service would have an adverse effect on real property values in the village of Larchmont due to the fact that many of the residents who use the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad would be forced to vacate their residences; and

Whereas the discontinuance of passenger service would increase the vehicular traffic in the already overcongested traffic in the city of New York; and

Whereas the merchants and small business people who conduct their business in the village of Larchmont rely upon the families of commuting residents, not only of Larchmont but of the neighboring villages of Mamaroneck and Scarsdale and the city of New Rochelle for their livelihood; and

Whereas the public convenience and necessity require the continuance of the passenger service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board opposes the application of the trustees of said railroad to discontinue passenger service and requests permission to intervene and send its representatives to hearings on this matter before the Interstate Commerce Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the mayor of the village of Larchmont is hereby authorized to appear and testify in said hearings being conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission on behalf of this Board and the residents of this

February 9, 1966

2521

build a little bit of highly institutionalized public housing. Neither course has involved a look at the total need of the community to provide educational, health, and recreational facilities on a broader base. The relocation of families has been looked at as a way to clear the land, but not as a way to build new communities.

Probably because many of these families are regarded by the rest of society as undesirable for social or economic reasons, no effort has been made to relocate these families so as to provide them with a new environment and a new opportunity to participate in the better schools, finer libraries, pleasanter neighborhoods. They have, on the whole, been relocated in neighborhoods very much like the ones they left, the older, poorer, less well served neighborhoods. And the relocation has too often recreated the problems which were the basis for the original slum clearance legislation of the 30's which is the predecessor of the present laws for rebuilding our cities.

Today every displacement of low-income families should be looked upon as an opportunity to locate (not relocate) families in such a way as to avoid future problems of segregation by class or race into schools and institutions which reflect the weakness and inability of the poor to secure for themselves the share of even public facilities which they need. The problem then is not to stop the displacement of low-income families, but to use it in such a way as to provide society with an opportunity to build healthy neighborhoods, healthy schools, and healthy public facilities. Viewed in this way, relocation of low-income families is a goal of society, not just the unpleasant byproduct of urban renewal.

ROBERT G. "BOBBY" BAKER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the January 29, 1966, issue of the Minneapolis Tribune there appeared an article by Clark Mollenhoff, entitled "Baker Loses Vending Pact With Northrop."

Even though the Defense Department still extends a security clearance to Mr. Baker and his company I am glad to note that the defense plants have seen fit to cancel these contracts which, to say the least, were obtained under very questionable circumstances.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

BAKER LOSES VENDING PACT WITH NORTHROP (By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Bobby Baker financial enterprises have suffered another setback in losing a vending machine contract with Northrop Corp.

Officials of Northrop told the Tribune Friday that Baker's Serv-U Vending Co. is no longer serving any of Northrop's plants.

It was explained that Baker's contract expired at the end of the year, and bids were asked for a new contract for the Northrop plants at Ventura and Anaheim, Calif. The contracts that Baker had with the Ventura and Anaheim plants constituted about 25 to 30 percent of the Northrop vending business.

Automatic Canteen had the bulk of the business at the main Northrop plant at Hawthorne, Calif.

Baker was not the low bidder, Northrop officials said, and so he was dropped.

Within the last 2 months, North American Aviation Co. stopped doing business with Serv-U. That was the first major financial

blow to Baker's lucrative food vending business with big defense contractors.

The North American contract grossed more than \$2,500,000 a year for Serv-U Vending. The Northrop contract was reported to be in excess of \$500,000 a year.

Together, these two contracts made up "the backbone of Baker's financial empire," according to the Republican minority report on the investigation of the "gross improprieties" of Baker, the former secretary to the Democratic majority of the Senate.

Baker's vending business with big defense contractors came in for sharp criticism from the Democrats as well as the Republicans on the Senate Rules Committee.

The Republican minority in its official report stated that "until such time as defense contractors such as North American Aviation and Northrop decide they no longer want to do business with Baker, his complete financial empire may continue."

TOWARD AN ASIAN BALANCE OF POWER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this may not be the easiest time for the United States to take a long view of its foreign policy, embroiled as we are in the day-to-day tensions of a war of potentially catastrophic dimensions. Nations, like soldiers, do not plan their future from foxholes.

And yet events can force upon us shadowy conclusions which point toward the future. The very inability of the United States to work its will in Asia can force a realization, as Eric Sevareid wrote recently, that:

The concept of America as missionary and the world as our sick oyster declines in the face of ancient realities.

While writing this Mr. Savareid, who has grown increasingly concerned with our Asian policy in recent weeks, spoke of the need to achieve in the Far Eastern half of the globe the "rough but so far effective balance of power" worked out in the Western World, largely between the United States and Russia.

Mr. Sevareid concluded:

For us, the question that must be answered in 1966 is how to make the Vietnam war a foundation stone in the construction of an Asiatic balance of power and not a pit into which we and China slide, bringing down everyone else with us to unmeasurable grief.

This long view of American policy is extremely necessary. Mr. Sevareid's thoughtful comments deserve to be carefully considered, and I ask unanimous consent that his weekly column, appearing in the January 27 edition of the Idaho Observer, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TOWARD AN ASIAN BALANCE OF POWER (By Eric Sevareid)

In this second third, now ending, of the brutal and brilliant 20th century, Europe lost its 2,000-year-old position as the dynamic source of both thought and power, and the power, at least, has been reformed in and three new centers of America, Russia, and China. The three have been groping and thrusting, half blindly, to affect and to discover the terms of existence in this new, three-cornered world of power.

Russia and the United States have been at it longer than Communist China, which consolidated its internal order only a few years ago. The first two have had, by now, a long series of sobering experiences with each other, both as hot war friends and cold war foes, and they have therefore changed much more in their outlook and tactics than have the old ideologists still alive in Peking.

It is too early for an incautious acceptance of the idea of "parallelism" in foreign policy between the United States and Russia. But they parallel one another in the basic spirit of desiring to minimize the risks of another global war.

The confrontation over the Cuban missiles was a major turning point; they have backed warily off from one another since, certainly on Berlin, certainly on Africa's troubled waters, and in degree on Vietnam. And in the meantime a potential of common interest and attitude in calming China down has developed.

It was only a few years ago that Moscow looked with philosophical favor, at a minimum, on exterior wars and upheavals. Yet now we see the significant spectacle of Moscow acting as peacemaker between India and Pakistan. The chief reason for this is simple: it is China.

A rough but so far effective balance of power has been worked out in the Western World, with Europe, and partly over the head of Europe. If Vietnam can be kept down to the scale of an episode, however violent, in the groping search for an order in Asia, then the chief international business of the last third of this century is likely to be the working out of a lasting balance of power for the Far Eastern half of the globe.

The resources, the attention, and the nerves of Americans are now deeply and perhaps permanently committed both east and west. We enter 1966 with more than 1 million American military men stationed beyond our borders, and when one adds their dependents and all the civilian workers, both private and governmental, there is a total of around 2½ million American citizens now living in and daily affecting foreign societies.

Except during the two great wars of this century we have never had this experience on such a scale. We are having extreme difficulty even in comprehending the meaning of this American impact abroad, let alone managing it.

The small problems involved, of course, multiply endlessly. But while the dominating problems of our very security have greatly changed in these years, they have not, by any means, all changed for the worse. Western Europe did not, after all, fall into the Soviet orbit, West Berlin still stands. The destructive illusion of remorselessly advancing Russian power, both terrestrial and spatial, was broken with their retreat over Cuba and by our own leaps in space.

The frightening specter of a stupendous Russian-Chinese power collectively has been laid. The fear that there was an automatic inevitability about the spread of communism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America has been greatly relieved by events in Indonesia, in a dozen African States and by the democratic resilience demonstrated by countries like Venezuela and Chile.

As we live and learn in our new world role, philosophical shifts are detectable, in Washington and in the universities. The concept of America as missionary and the world as our sick oyster declines in the face of ancient realities. The European spirit of holding moral obligations within the boundaries of practical capacities seems to grow stronger. A certain dichotomy develops at home.

As the London Economist expresses it, "The combination of intellectuals studying the interest of the state at one end of the scale while other intellectuals protest in the name

international law on blockades, background of Security Council decision on Korean war, method Security Council acts on charges of aggression, power lack of General Assembly in case Security Council inactive.

HARRY H. BERGBAUER.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

Mr. HARRY H. BERGBAUER,
Monterey, Calif.:

You should go back to school and learn about the most elementary tenets of international law and right of free Americans to be protected from government by secrecy.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the newest Member of the U.S. Senate is the son and the nephew of two of my closest friends. I am delighted that he is a member of two of my committees—the Armed Services Committee and the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. In the short time that he has been in the Senate he has given clear evidence that he is molded in the image of his father and that he will unfalteringly follow in the illustrious footsteps of his father.

Recently he made an extremely interesting speech at a luncheon meeting of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. It is a speech worthy of your attention and so I ask unanimous consent that the address of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., before that institute on February 3, 1966, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, JR., DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, BEFORE LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS, NATIONAL CAPITAL SECTION, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1966

I have come here today to meet members of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Capital section, my new friends of air and space.

As the newest Member of the Senate, the newest member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, and therefore the newest expert in the field, I am hard pressed for something to say to you about your own business.

I am a Virginian and a Democrat. When I am hard pressed for words of wisdom, it is natural that I turn to Thomas Jefferson. As usual, he has something appropriate to say.

In a 1788 letter to Ralph Izard he said this: "I have never thought boys should undertake abstruse and difficult sciences * * * til 15 years of age, at soonest. Before that time they are best employed learning the languages, which is merely a matter of memory."

I am over 15. So it is all right for me to undertake committee work in aeronautical and space sciences. I had not majored in the language before, but I am learning it now.

NASA has provided me with a dictionary in the language of art. With it and your help, I am applying myself enthusiastically to both the homework and the committee classroom study.

I want you to know that while I may be new to the aerospace committee, my interest is not new. I am fascinated by the whole span of the subject from Virginia to Mars.

I think I am entitled to start with Vir-

ginia because we have not only highly important Government aeronautical and space activities, but also a rapidly increasing educational and industrial interest in the field.

NASA's Langley Research Center—under NACA in earlier days—has been working on the aeronautic and space frontiers since 1917, and it is a pioneer in the Apollo plan to land U.S. explorers on the moon.

At Wallops Island—Virginia's Cape Kennedy—NASA has its principal readout station in eastern United States, and from here hundreds of rockets have been launched in the interest of rocket technology and knowledge of the earth's atmospheric makeup.

The new Virginia Associated Research Center-Cyclotron complex—a NASA-higher-institution-of-learning venture in the Hampton-Newport News area—with adjacent research park, is attracting technical industry attention.

As chairman of the Virginia Advisory Board on Industrial Development, I am advised that NASA prime contracts totaling nearly \$120 million were awarded in 27 Virginia counties and cities between 1961 and 1965.

The rising amounts of these contracts are evidence of the increasing aeronautics and space-related industry in the State. In 1961 the contracts totaled \$6.8 million. In 1965 they totaled \$42.8 million.

I hope this kind of industry—electronics, aeronautical, space and related—will continue to increase in Virginia. Perhaps nothing dramatizes our changing world so much as the achievements in aeronautical and space sciences.

Nonetheless sure, if less dramatic, are changes in other lines of endeavor—in business and government—and as businessmen and individuals we must be alert to change. As businessmen and individuals we must look ahead. Legislators, also, must look ahead. We must be alert to changing times, conditions, and opportunities.

I want to be a friend in court to all who are engaged in sound progress. Progress means change. But in science, business, and government we must recognize that there are certain fundamentals that do not change.

The arithmetic table, for example, does not change. Two and two still make four. The fact that taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who works is another fundamental that I cannot forget.

I hope my position in the field of aeronautics and space sciences will be characterized by a balanced combination of fiscal responsibility and dedication to the search for new knowledge and its useful application.

I am aware of the responsibilities incident to legislating in the space age. We have passed a milestone in history and started a new epoch. The bond of gravity has been broken. Manmade devices have orbited the sun and photographed the moon.

My uncle, the late Adm. Richard E. Byrd, undertook some pioneering and exploring in his day. The closest I ever came to exploring even the earthly reaches was riding in his New York tickertape parade.

My Senate committee assignments notwithstanding, I may want to ponder a little more the idea of keeping vigil alone on the Moon and exploring Mars.

Meanwhile, we look forward to supersonic transports. I notice in a recent speech by NASA Administrator James E. Webb, that he sees hypersonic transports a little further in the future. We look forward also to broadcasts via satellite directly to home receivers, probes of distant planets, conventional take-off and landing in space vehicles, nuclear engines, and so on.

These achievements in the future will be no more fantastic than the accomplishments of the past 10 years. They are the products of industrious men who are giving new thrust to the old sciences—astronomy, physics, chemistry, and geology.

To these are added the force of new techniques and engineering in materials, structures, fuels, power sources, and electronics.

We tend to think of the spectacular breakthroughs of the space age. Equally important are the side results of space requirements for improved standards, and reliability of performance—mechanical and human.

We are getting new materials—metals, fabrics, plastics, and lubricants—which are tougher, long lived, and more versatile than we have previously known.

We are getting better washing machines, household appliances, television sets, and so on.

Weathered-in as we have been for the past week, the job of the weather satellites comes particularly to mind. The Weather Bureau has estimates showing that 5-day weather predictions annually would save the economy \$2.5 billion in agriculture; \$4 billion in water resources management; \$100 million in surface transportation; \$75 million in retail marketing; and \$45 million in the lumber industry.

Comsat (Communications Satellite Corp.) is approaching its third anniversary. Its Early Bird satellite, launched less than a year ago, opened a new and promising communications era.

Dr. Joseph V. Charyk, before our committee on January 26, said Early Bird successors would be capable of transmitting television, telephone, and data service simultaneously.

He said 48 nations had signed agreements for the establishment of an international partnership, owned 55 percent by COMSAT, to establish and operate the space portion of a global satellite system.

The purpose is creation of a single global commercial communication satellite system at the earliest possible date. The 48 signatories account for at least 90 percent of the potential international world telecommunications traffic that might be served by the system.

Our national policy stresses peaceful space exploration and use of this new domain. Unfortunately space developments to date have military implications which impose awesome responsibility.

While we seek cooperative peaceful development, we have no choice but to acquire space capabilities for the protection of our national interest and humanity.

I wish I could close without reference to war. But we are still sitting on a world war III powder keg at this moment. I pray that it will not develop into a nuclear holocaust.

Despite our great private and public interest in peaceful aeronautic and space development, the Vietnam war is the dominant question before the Nation today.

It is a conflict which is of deep concern in both the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It is of deep concern to me, and to you, and to fathers and mothers of draft-age sons all over the country.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I completed yesterday a week of secret committee sessions studying testimony by Secretary of Defense McNamara and the military Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The proceedings are classified, but I believe each witness answered frankly the multitude of questions put to him. Without breach of security, I can say many of the statements by both witnesses and Senators were cause for thoughtful concern with respect to basic policy.

There was no quibbling among members of the Armed Services Committee about essential military expenditures. For myself, I shall support all military expenses necessary to bring the Vietnam war to successful conclusion.

It will require time to assimilate the views expressed by our top military authorities in a weeklong interrogation. Until then, we can only hope that this war—which at the

February 9, 1966

morally right and politically wise. Your friends are legion. Press on.

RICHARD L. HAPWORTH.

MANCHESTER, CONN.,

February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your forthright statements today on TV. Thank God for your sanity and courage.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT C. VATER.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,

February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud position for open Senate hearings, all levels regarding Vietnam.

NANCY ADLEY.

RANGELY, COLO.,

February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for insisting on open hearings to the public and less secrecy in Government stuff. We need more people like you.

TIOULA THEOS.

ORANGE, CALIF.,

February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you. May your investigation end this barbaric Vietnam war and save numerous lives.

Mr. and Mrs. THEODORE SHAPIN.

SHERMAN OAKS, CALIF.,

February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand today regarding McNamara's appearance. Wish we could vote for you here.

CATHERINE SCHNEIDER.

WEBB CITY, MO.,

February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Keep pushing to inform the public.

JOANN BEASON.

ANAMOSA, IOWA,

February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

For the benefit of humanity insist on appearance in public of McNamara, Wheeler, and Rusk. Godspeed.

MOBLE A. SMITH.

BENEFIT PARK, CALIF.,

February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your stand in Senate hearings on Vietnam regarding present illegal and immoral war.

Mr. and Mrs. RICHARD GARRISON.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,

February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

A million thanks for your magnificent stand against secret and dictatorial government, graft, waste, dishonesty, disloyalty, and the criminal waste of the lives of American boys in Vietnam. Keep it up. You are performing a long overdue service to the American people. Please have secretary write us receipt.

Mr. and Mrs. DAVID E. WILLIAMS.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have some additional telegrams I received, with my replies.

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

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I think you should support our boys in Vietnam. I am an ex-marine.

TERRY McFAUL.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

TERRY McFAUL,
Brooklyn, N.Y.:

You are the one who is not supporting our boys because you agree they should be sacrificed in an unconstitutional and indefensible war.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

WARWICK, R.I.,

February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are a demagog.

B. J. SIRR.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

B. J. SIRR,
Warwick, R.I.:

I hope you feel better.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Americans of Irish Descent Club back the President.

MR. CONLAN,
President

FEBRUARY 9, 1966

Mr. CONLAN,
President, Americans of Irish Descent Club,
New York, N.Y.:

I am not impressed.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

WHEATON, ILL.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

"Mr. President, whom do you refer to?"

You, of course.

The refusal of appeasers and pacifists to recognize the ultimate goal of communism these past 30 years is the reason our boys are dying. Their young lives must be sacrificed because of your stupidity.

Continue your bombasts so more Americans can get to know you. With contempt.

Mrs. JOHN F. SEEMAN.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

Mrs. JOHN F. SEEMANN,
Wheaton, Ill.:

Our men are dying in Asia because our Government is violating the constitutional and treaty obligations it owes to them and the rest of the American people.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

January 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Senator, inasmuch as you have so much to say about the President's policy in south-

east Asia including Vietnam, I consider you a turncoat. If I were you, I would go to Russia and apply for a seat in the Russian Presidium because that's where you belong.

CARLOS J. RUIZ.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

CARLOS J. RUIZ,
New York, N.Y.:

I was not elected to rubberstamp the President's unconstitutional war but it is obvious that you wouldn't understand the meaning of constitutional rights.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

THE DALLES, OREG.,

January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Remove at once our names from your mailing list. As lifelong registered Democrats we are not ready to change horses in the middle of the stream as you apparently are.

EARL L. AND VERDA R. ROGERS.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

EARL L. AND VERDA R. ROGERS,
The Dalles, Oreg.:

I am sorry you are so upset over the facts concerning our unconstitutional war in Asia.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.,

February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have a priority on secretiveness our security declare your source of information in committee hearing if you wish public opinion to go along with you on McNamara and Wheeler.

Mrs. STEN H. STENSON.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

Mrs. STEN H. STENSON,
Northampton, Mass.:

McNamara and Wheeler would be asked only to discuss U.S. policies that got us into this war and their policies for continuing it. All secret matters that involve security questions would be answered only in executive sessions. Public is entitled to public hearings on policy questions.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

WOODBURN, OREG.,

February 5, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a senior citizen of Oregon I have supported you. After today's report going back to Republicans.

M. R. CRAWFORD.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

Mr. M. R. CRAWFORD,
Woodburn, Oreg.:

May I ask good naturedly when you go back to the Republicans are you going to support Hatfield whose views on foreign policy are similar to mine? If you study more about the facts of our unconstitutional war in Asia you may think better of my position on the issue.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

MONTEREY, CALIF.,

January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senior Staff Assistant,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Re today's hearings shocked you let your Senator appear so uninformed concerning

February 9, 1966

battles. It is far too expensive in American lives and dollars. Keep fighting for us.

Mrs. S. SIMON.

OSSINING, N.Y.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Previously I have not agreed with you. Watching your hearing today I can only say as a World War II veteran—let's have a strategic retreat and let them try to come our way.

WILLIAM L. ANDERSON.

HORSE CAVE, KY.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Behind you 100 percent. Keep the good work going as you see fit.

OTIS E. GILPIN.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, keep going.

K. DIETER.

WILMINGTON, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for your stand on McNamara. We are with you.

GEO. and HELEN SWARTZ.

ROCKY MOUNT, N.C.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Impressed by you this morning as part of Foreign Relations Committee. I hope you are against the United States offering help to Britain in its Rhodesian situation as a bribe for withdrawing its trade with the Vietcong. I would appreciate your views.

Mrs. MARY I. ELMORE.

FOSTORIA, OHIO,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee Chairman,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for what you're doing. Please give us more TV hearings; the public needs to know.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT.

GAINESVILLE, FLA.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you, thank you. Keep it up until hell freezes over.

JOHN H. REYNOLDS.

ALTADENA, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Want the facts on Vietnam. This is a democracy or we live in vain.

PAUL and NORMA MULLER.

MISSION, TEX.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Vietnam war is the result of our disastrous foreign policy. We are world meddlers. One dollar of foreign aid is too much, especially when it comes out of the baby's piggybank. You are right all hearings should be in the open. It's high time

we lend our best brains toward getting out of Vietnam and come home where we belong.

Thanks. Best regards.

C. F. SPIKES.

CLEARWATER, FLA.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. The Nation needs more leaders like you.

Thanks.

LEO and MARY KOTRASCHECK.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Just heard your statement on Vietnam war on TV. Want you to know I support your position.

ROBERTA RAY.

WESTON, CONN.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you on your stand against war. We pray for your efforts toward peace.

Mr. and Mrs. IRVING WHITE.

STEVENS POINT, WIS.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand in foreign policy. Our faith renewed.

Dr. and Mrs. PAUL SOWKA.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are thoroughly behind your statements made this afternoon on TV as to this war and hope that you can continue to press your views.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. DONALD C. NYGREN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for being a good American. Today it is a wonderful thing to hear someone call a spade a spade, to have someone represent you who is not afraid of the den of lions. I admire you, respect you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BEATRICE HENDERSON.

LANCASTER, PA.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hear, hear.

JULIA and GEORGE WARWICK.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good fight. Commonsense may yet prevail. You are absolutely right in demanding that the administration be forced to explain its actions. They have been wrong so many times in the past with regard to Vietnam that the public has a right to question every aspect of this issue. Thank God you've got the guts to do it.

LEW MAYER.

TULSA, OKLA.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please, please stop this war that's killing all our young boys. If Johnson wants to go on let him go and fight. Thank you, Senator, for your stand on this issue.

GEORGE BUELKE.

CAMINO, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

America exists only as in idea and an ideal. You are one of the few protecting the America in which I believe. My gratitude and admiration are yours.

MARIAN WISHART.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support Senator MORSE. All witnesses in Senate Foreign Relations hearings be open to public.

Mr. and Mrs. EDWARD SINGLER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support Senator MORSE on open hearings. No more Government policy by secrecy.

ROSE and GEORGE LEELOY.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Five adults watching TV, all agree with thee, God bless you.

M. J. DINNEEN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank God for your statements in the committee room this a.m. while speaking to Mr. Bell. American people will give their lives for an open, honest, decent Government but will balk when asked to defend, what to them, is unjust and not according to our Constitution. Thank you for your stand on these matters.

Sincerely,

Mrs. M. E. KAUFMANN.

SPOKANE, WASH.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

After today public television, thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

ED HOIER.

CHARLESTON, S.C.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your speech today on TV. We heartily agree with what you expressed. God bless you and keep working for us.

Mrs. HOWARD McIVER.

SHERMAN OAKS, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Profound respect for your courage, perspicacity, and integrity. Believe you to be

February 9, 1966

who at a time in history stands alone breathing some sanity into the incredible indifference of his colleagues.
Mr. and Mrs. JEFFERY TROY.

ROOSEVELT, N.J.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We love what you're doing. Keep it up.
FRANK and JEAN HERMAN.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are a true patriot. I am with you. Keep it up.

CATHERINE DMYTRYK.

CROVELAND, FLA.
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Before all is lost, our freedoms are being revived by your courageous leadership. We are praying for your fearless ongoing efforts and on continued firm dedication to truth. We thank God for your statesmanship.

OLGA ROSEN.

MERRION STATION, PA.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your tireless work in investigating the situation in Vietnam. You are to be congratulated for your honorable service to the people of our country.

CHLOE D. ROME.

CHENDALE, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you, thank you for your firm stand today.
Sincerely,

Mrs. DOROTHY REID.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Commend sanity your position Vietnam. Support Senate's comprehensive re-evaluation Vietnam policy. Urge return to utilization advise and consent role. Posture re China rigid unimaginative. Diplomatic relations other intercourse essential to eliminate historic antagonisms. China must participate international community if stability and nuclear control to be achieved.

ROBERT Z. ALPERN.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Good work, but no Asian war, get out of Vietnam.

COMMUNITY PROJECTS COMMITTEE OF
THE VIETNAM DAY COMMITTEE.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

What are we doing in Vietnam? United States of America needs schools, hospitals, housing in the South of United States of America. I am with you.

Mrs. RAYMONDE NOTMANN.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have a soldier son. Watching you on television. Agree with you wholeheartedly. Warmest wishes. Congratulations. Our prayers are with you in your efforts for peace. Warmest personal regards. Looking forward to meeting you in person.

Mrs. DAVID (RUTH) HAUCK.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for this afternoon's performance. There are millions behind you.
FROM THE VOICES IN THE WILDERNESS.

POM ENCIÑO, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work in helping the taxpayers.

RICHARD MALOSEK.

BOSTON, MASS.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for providing some long awaited information on the question of Vietnam.

B. A. RAY.

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee, New Senate
Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

As an American citizen I thank you for your courage in speaking out re the illegal war we are waging in Vietnam. I share your points of view and love for our country. You have my deepest admiration.

Sincerely,

ELAYNE LAING.

PEABODY, MASS.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your firm stand on airing our involvements in southeast Asia. Please make all efforts to place our spotted knight in shining armor (the band leader) before the committee and the American people in a public hearing. This crusader needs an airing.
Congratulations from America's conscience.

ROBERT MAURIN.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Your statement Government by secrecy and comments Vietnam. You have my trust.

Mrs. H. C. HOORNSTRA.

RIPON, WIS.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

While seeing and listening to your views on our illegal war, military, and corporate war makers, and Government secrecy, President Johnson announced he was leaving the country and taking Rusk, McNamara, and others with him. In my opinion, your views are validated by this new attempt to evade public exposure of administrative du-

plicity. Thank God for men like you in the Senate.

FRANK M. DUMAS, Ph. D.,
Department of Psychology,
Ripon College.

CEDAR FALLS, IOWA,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree with your comments on Vietnam situation wholeheartedly. There are many loyal Americans who feel as you do. Do all you can to bring this illegal war to an end.

Mrs. S. A. RIDENOUR.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your eloquent remarks to Mr. Bell on Thailand this afternoon.

MARY ANN PAYNE.

EAU GALLIE, FLA.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work. Do not give up. You are right. I am a Republican.

Mrs. ANNA BARTELSON.

BENTON HARBOR, MICH.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Information of an indigenous compels me to believe that you should enlarge upon your probe.

JAMES T. MORRISSEY.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Behind you 100 percent on Vietnam stand. Wish were more like you in Washington.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN DELL'ARCO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May God bless you in your courageous fight to preserve article 1 of our Constitution.

TED BIRNBERG.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge you to continue investigating U.S. position in Vietnam. Continue your good work.

PHYLLIS PATTERSON.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wholeheartedly support your position on Vietnam.

PAUL C. SHAW.

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your viewpoint against our position in Vietnam. Feelings on this are the same. We cannot fight everyone's

February 9, 1966

MOBILE, ALA.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

My recollection is that after Mr. Harold Wilson's visit with Mr. Johnson last year Washington Journalists Robert Allen and Paul Scott wrote that Mr. Johnson agreed not to interfere with British shipping into North Vietnam in exchange for British oral support of administration's Vietnamese policy. Please check with mentioned journalists.

Mrs. JOHN H. MELVILLE.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your firm stand today insisting Secretary McNamara appear for a public hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I am a confused citizen too. Your committee and NBC have done a great service to all Americans presenting witness David Bell today. When possible please continue televising hearings so vital to the present and future of our country.

Mrs. GRACE S. CORWIN.

LAKESIDE, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks we are with you.

Mr. and Mrs. J. H. HUNTLEY.

ONTONAGON, MICH.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations generally, and specifically on your refusal to be a party to closed session testimony.

Dr. and Mrs. D. H. ARCHIBALD,
Mr. and Mrs. DAVID HUNT,
Mr. and Mrs. MATT VIOLA,
Mr. and Mrs. LAURI WESA,
Mr. TED TRUDGEON,
Rev. and Mrs. GEORGE LUCIANI.

LENOX, MASS.,
January 4, 1966.Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. I envy the people of Oregon their great privilege of being represented by you.

NATHAN GEORGE HORWITT.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: God bless you thank you for your efforts for peace.

RAMONA VEGLIA.

CLIFTON, N.J.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Johnson's Vietnam policy is inhuman, bestial and depressing. I compliment your noble thoughts voiced on television last Sunday. You are a "profile in courage." I am a New Jersey resident and have informed Senator WILLIAMS about my distaste for this war.

Sincerely,

Mrs. S. QUATINETZ.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

May you strong voice continue to awaken American people and Congressmen to danger

of Government by Star Chamber sessions. Congress and confused public have allowed U.S. public representative Government to be increasingly replaced by secret White House-Pentagon session. The people cannot be trusted? Big brother Government is here. This insidious erosion of democracy has already produced the Vietnam mess. Your courageous efforts to expose the machinations of the executive branch and by such exposure to possibly end this terrible Vietnam debacle has the warm support of my family, my friends, and colleagues.

Mrs. RICHARD DEMOREST.

JONESBORO, ARK.,
January 4, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: I greatly appreciate what you are doing. Don't let up.

JAMES A. HUTCHISON, Ph. D.

PARK FOREST, ILL.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you.

WALTER PERRY.

ROCKFORD, ILL.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.:

Got a lot of questions answered today but more investigation, please. Thanks, a taxpayer.

VIOLA FERRE.

WAUSAU, WIS.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The public hearings by your committee are restoring lifeblood to America. Nearly everyone I've heard comment on these is doing so enthusiastically and is right behind you. Keep them up and we may yet save the world.

CARL KLINE, M.D.

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am completely behind you on what you said this afternoon against the war in Vietnam.

H. BRUCE MARTIN.

HELENA, MONT.,
January 4, 1966.Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

SENATOR MORSE: Bless you. You are not in Johnson palm. Just paid my income tax and had to borrow money to pay it. Russia said they will spend ourselves to death and no fooling. Keep on the ball.

NANCY N. KAIN.

BOSTON, MASS.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo your eloquent TV statement on our illegal war. More should hear you.

PAUL TOUCHETTE.

DEERFIELD BEACH, FLA.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We stand behind your conviction on Vietnam. Keep fighting.

Mr. and Mrs. D. C. McMURRAY.

COPIAGUE, N.Y.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your position on Vietnam is a welcome relief from the war-bound dictatorial Johnson administration. We support all your efforts toward bringing our country back to law and order.

Mr. and Mrs. JULIUS SCHUBERT.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to a dedicated American.

LOUISE QUIGLEY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE E. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please never give up your magnificent fight.

STEPHEN M. ROSENTHAL.

YAKIMA, WASH.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am behind you in your good thinking about telling the American people the facts of our commitments in Vietnam.

R. J. CASH.

WORCESTER, MASS.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight—with you 100 percent. Anxious to hear you in Worcester March 25th.

ABBOTT HOFFMAN.

SILVER SPRING, MD.,
January 4, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senate Foreign Relation Committee should be represented in President's entourage to Hawaii. Why does President Johnson exclude members of your committee? You should be admitted to his discussions with Vietnam leaders.

JOHN CUNNINGHAM.

DERBY, CONN.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue the campaign to end the war in Vietnam; impress your legislative colleagues with this urgent necessity; Americans in increasing numbers demand that this legislatively unsanctioned conflict be brought to a close, so do I.

VICTOR L. SZANTON.

PADUCAH, KY.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully support your position on the Vietnam war; thank you for a courageous presentation on television today.

Sincerely,

PAUL ROWLAND.

NEWTON, MASS.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

All Americans owe Oregon a debt of gratitude for its wisdom in choosing a brave man

February 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

are both renegades. You deserted the Republicans and I deserted the Democrats but we have one fine thing in mind, it is our country. After hearing you today on TV talking to Bell I wondered what is right, should we have an independent party. There are so many of us in between, keep up the good fight to keep us as we should be. Please answer.

CHARLES COFFMAN.

VENTURA, CALIF.,

February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support and endorse your request to have Secretary McNamara appear in open public hearing to answer questions about America's involvement and conduct in South Vietnam.

VICTOR GOERTZEL,

For 25 members of the Ventura Peace Committee.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Good job well done. No more Hiroshimas. Keep up the good work. Best wishes.

DAVID RUBY.

EASTON, Md.,

February 5, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Democrat, Oregon,
Washington, D.C.:

We feel like Americans, although still Republicans, for the first time since F.D.R. began to teach dictatorship. After watching you today we cried "We are so happy we could spit," self-respect again. Democracy again. No matter what happens in Vietnam you and your friends have given us simple people face in a world for our grandchildren. If our son survives, its our fault. We allowed ourselves to be at the mercy of fools for more than a whole generation. God help you dig us out.

The EDWARDSSES MARYLAND.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,

February 5, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge inclusion of National Liberation Front representative at United Nations Honolulu Conference.

JUDITH KRAKAUER.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,

February 5, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you. Thank you for words you spoke against our part in this war.

Mrs. MELTZER.

IOWA CITY, IOWA,

February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

In our 35th day of vigil we with moral, ethical, and religious concerns commend you for submitting Vietnam crisis to the United Nations. Deplore the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam. Urge cessation of the bombing and urge negotiation directly with the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

Jon Armstrong, Roger C. Betz, William Buckles, William E. Conner, Anne Hogben, Martha Jablonski, Jim Kollros, Vae O'Mara, John O'Mara, Irving D. Marshall, Donald L. Spencer, Michael R. Theis, May Tangen, Joyce Thompson, Gary Smith, William M. Weir, Betsy Woodman, Jonathan J. Woodman.

STUDIO CITY, CALIF.

February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend you for your honest and courageous stand on Vietnam. Carry on. Dr. and Mrs. NORMAN O. LAVET.

ANGOLA, N.Y.

February 5, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Greatly encouraged by your televised statements and reasoning regarding United States involvement in Vietnam. Support your views completely. Have felt shame for years over our vicious hate propaganda against nations and peoples labeled Communists. Glad to see probe of the terminology. Unless identified with a specific nationality the word has little meaning. I am so grateful we have you in a position of influence. Keep up pressures for all these issues for ending war, closer congressional control and less executive power.

Respectively,

Mrs. HARLAND C. BUSH.

GOFFSTOWN, N.H.,

February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are with you. No secret committee. Stop the bombing.

Mr. and Mrs. RICHARD HAND.

SILVER SPRING, Md.,

February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support entirely your stand regarding hearings, McNamara, and war in Vietnam. Bravo.

Mr. and Mrs. EARL L. FOX.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,

February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your Vietnam attitude. Delighted at your insistence McNamara and Rusk testify publicly.

Mrs. ROBERT COATS.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,

February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support you fully in your position Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings this date.

Mr. and Mrs. Wm. J. RILEY, Jr.,

Mr. and Mrs. ROY G. RILEY.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT D. RILEY.

Mr. R. S. RILEY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,

January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily approve opposition to secret meetings. Americans entitled to know truth.

VINCENT and KATHLEEN LAWTON.

CICERO, ILL.,

January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to commend you and WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and other patriotic Senators on magnificent and courageous stand on Vietnam. May be last chance to prevent atomic holocaust. Incidentally what is difference be-

tween Vietnamese refugee camps and concentration camps of World War II?

Mr. and Mrs. LLOYD POWELL.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,

January 4, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Increasing percentage of Americans recognizing futility of administration Vietnam policy. Immoral to send Americans to die in undeclared war. We are inevitably moving toward vast land war in Asia without world support. Senate cannot abdicate its responsibilities. Time is running out and it is not on our side. Aren't we big and powerful enough to admit a mistake and reverse a bad course. Let's have fewer pious words and more honest appraisal and action.

STEPHEN RUBEL.

ERIE, PA.,

January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At last a voice of inspiration and truth to a frightened mother this past week has been a time of hope for me after the televised debate last Sunday and the Senate hearing today. I agree with you entirely on the Vietnam situation and hope you continue on forcing the truth on these war profiteering hypocrites. I am a mother of two teenage boys who finds it hard enough to instill truth, justice, and consideration in her children. But after seeing the televised action of one of our young men in Vietnam during the Christmas holidays where he shot a young Vietnamese mother of three toddlers for not understanding or perhaps protecting her own, I wonder if it is worth it all to struggle to teach ones sons to be good and considerate of others only to have them be turned into storm troopers like the Nazis did. I object to our young men being taught this type of brutality. I want to thank you for a spark of hope.

Yours truly,

Mrs. EMMA FINNELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.:

What this country needs are more Democrats like you. If we had them I would join your ranks. Keep up your excellent work. We appreciate you.

IRENE A. DAVIS.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,

January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily support your courageous investigation of our Vietnam policy.

PENNY SHEPHARD.

CATLINBURG, TENN.,

January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Televised public hearing Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a historic step forward in democratic government. Congratulations and continued success.

HUBERT BERR.

PORT ISABEL, TEX.,

January 4, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations your stand against Government secrecy relative our foreign affairs.

J. G. MITCHELL.

February 9, 1966

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I am with you 100 percent. Keep going strong.

MARY McNOVLEBOSCOE,
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep fighting to slow down the war. Support you 100 percent.

ROLAND and ELAYNE GARRETT,
WAYNE, MICH.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly agree that Secretary McNamara should testify in public session. As a former serviceman who shed sweat, blood, and tears in that war I think the public should know what is really happening. Bravo.

JAMES and JOAN HARRINGTON,
AMARILLO, TEX.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Demand of President that McNamara, Wheeler, and any other Government official, be ordered to appear before Senate Foreign Relations Committee in open public sessions. We the people who are supplying money, men, are entitled to know full details. Military has too long hidden their stupidity behind security reasons.

DALTON and DORICE MYERS,
MIDLAND PARK, N.J.,
January 4, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Disapprove most your policies. Heartily approve your attitude on blockade expressed on tonight's newscast hearing.

LAWRENCE W. O'DONNELL, Esq.,
PASADENA CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Once I was on Okinawa for 18 months. We had a black market right under the noses of the Army, everything was stolen and offered for sale. Vietnam cannot be so different regards to scrip, many Americans take advantage of the call in of scrip. Think of the native people who hold scrip and cannot exchange it. Many Americans have taken advantage of opportunities, your position makes me feel that there is yet a need for people like you.

CLAUDE CLINE,
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your stand on public rather than secret testimony about the Vietnam war.

D. S. GERSTOFF,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have our full support in your moves to enlighten the American people about Vietnam. Good luck.

Mr. and Mrs. SEYMOR YESNER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington D.C.:

You have our full support in your moves to enlighten the American people about Vietnam. Good luck.

Mr. and Mrs. KENNETH J. ENKEL.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your candor and honesty are refreshing. We have a right to know the truth about this ridiculous war. Good luck and keep digging.

HOWARD PORPER.

HUNTINGTON, N.Y.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your public position concerning U.S. foreign policy and in particular your demand that Secretary McNamara openly testify before Foreign Relations Committee.

Muriel Kantner, Nanett Salzman, Betty Sue Lentz, Sam Raskin, Gertrude Alberts, Seymour Alberts, Jean Levine, Theodore Saldman, Betty Barkell, Richard Barkell, Ruth Kelsey, Sally Lineweaver, Stephanie Elkind, Louis Kantner, Valettdh Sculthorpe.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your vallant stand today against bureaucratic secrecy. The destiny of our country must be shaped on the understanding you promote—not Johnson militarism.

PHILLIP G. STRON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard your broadcast today on television. Long may you live and fight for peace. God bless you.

HELEN M. HAYBALL.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your stand on Vietnam. Don't let the Pentagon run our country.

F. EUGENE V. THAYER.

LUBBOCK, TEX.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SIR: Stick by your guns there's still a few of us who would like to know what's going on in this Great Society. We do not need those top three.

CHARLES H. CHAMBERLAIN.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to you and the few who have joined your side. We the people have had enough of political generosity outside the United States which has only made enemies for us. Your State must be very proud of you. The overburdened American

taxpayer deserves better than such totalitarian tactics.

SYBIL and PETER FITZGERALD.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on protest against Government secrecy and demand for Rusk and McNamara public testimony.

MILDRED ROGERS.

LEWISBURG, PA.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, the President may not approve but history will. If Secretary McNamara continues to refuse to testify publicly, suggest that you release to press series of questions on his past predictions.

WILLIAM HARBOUGH.

BATTLE GROUND, WASH.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Issues you raised today on TV urgently need airing. Please continue your pursuit.

C. W. BROWN.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Force McNamara to testify before your committee.

RAY SNYDER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Your championing of our right to know is deeply appreciated. I understand we are against communism but what are we for. Our foreign policy seems to be a kiss of death.

HARVEY STRZOK.

GLEN ELLEN, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for representing us. Wish we had more Senators with your guts.

HARRY CUTHBERTSON.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Two Americans are behind you 100 percent in today's action. Please continue to fight.

DOLORES SNYDER.

NEY YORK, N.Y.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily approve of your attitude. Please keep it up. McNamara is a Lord North.

GILBERT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your speaking up for the people today. We

February 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2501

TUPPER LAKE, N.Y.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding David C. E. Bell's testimony as of today, only minutes ago I heard and saw you on television, make a statement relating to certain Government officials hiding behind a curtain of secrecy when asked to give public testimony. You are to be congratulated. Secretaries McNamara and Rusk are eating out of the executive branch hands; namely, President Johnson.

WARREN KAY.

MONTPELIER, VT.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse your demands for open public hearings on Vietnam policy. Courage.
Major and Mrs. C. R. COONDS.

ALEXANDRIA, LA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your stand for public open hearings. Stay with it.

T. I. BLACK.

LAFAYETTE, I.A.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee Hearing,
Washington, D.C.:

The mothers and fathers of this country back your position on no further closed door hearings on Vietnam.

We would like to know if U.S. Government was not primarily more interested in obtaining a military base within Vietnam to increase our encirclement of Russia and China more than the purported purposes to aid the South Vietnam people from aggression. The latter reason served only as a purpose to gain a means. We are now caught in quicksand. The harder we struggle the more we become involved.

WILLIAM H. WHITE.

PLUSHING, N.Y.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks to you and your colleagues for representing the public.

T. S. K. JOHANSSON.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Warmly support your views and present investigation of Vietnam war.

NELL MILLER.

ELKHART, IND.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Watched TV all morning. Public hearing wonderful and proper. Agree with you.
Mrs. HELEN STUMP.

BROOKPARK, OHIO,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your open hearing policy with respect to McNamara and Wheeler. Wish there were more legislators with your views.

Mr. and Mrs. WAYNE GANDY.

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZ.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Tremendously proud of your courage and wisdom re Vietnam and Government by secrecy. Your supporters are many. Stick by your guns for the sake of this Nation.

J. N. CHRISTIANSON.

STURGEON BAY, WIS.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

High time somebody has courage to pose bona fide questions and demand truthful answers. The people have the right to know the truth. You have reflected the feelings of millions.

RICHARD and CAROLYN LEHMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue to insist that Vietnam policy be examined in open hearings.

CHARLES GOEHRER.

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my support on your stand regarding McNamara and Rusk.

HOWARD H. HYDER.

HORNELL, N.Y.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You're just as great as Senator Norris.

ROBERT SULLIVAN.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Glad to see that someone has the nerve to speak up against McNamara today.

Mrs. THOMAS UNDERK.

TONAWANDA, N.Y.,
December 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my thanks for the courage you displayed in saying the American people should know what's going on in our Federal Government. Yes, we do want the facts, Senator MORSE, and I appreciate getting them first-hand rather than the interpretations of newsmen.

Mrs. THOMAS DAVIS.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
December 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Just heard your TV statement regarding McNamara and our Government "closed door policy" and extend congratulations for your initiative and fortitude.

MELVIN DAVIS.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your stand on Vietnam. Approve stand against secrecy in hearings.

Mr. and Mrs. LOUIS SHUB.

ATLANTA, GA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you from my heart for your courage this morning. I wish I could claim you as my representative but as an American thank you again for making democracy ring true.

Mrs. GEO. SMALL.

MOBILE, ALA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Heartily agree with your strong stand against committee hearings in secret. Public needs knowledge.

Mrs. WALKER R. GREAVES.

HAVERFORD, PA.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

One hundred students conducting 8-day fast as expression of extreme protest against administration Vietnam policy.

HAVERFORD and BRYNMAWR COLLEGE FASTERS.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We have just been viewing the TV program and we concur wholeheartedly with your stand on bringing Mr. McNamara and Mr. Rusk out in the open to face certain questions which will tend to clear up the gray area which has existed for a long time and still exist today. I am father of two sons both within military age. I think the American public is most appreciative of your stand. I know that I am as a father, a citizen, and a veteran.

A. MITROVICH.

CHERRY HILL, N.J.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to express profound gratitude for your statesmanship, honesty, humanity. You are a great American.

RUTH R. KRAUSE and JOSEPH M. KRAUSE.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Think you and Senator FULBRIGHT are wonderful and I agree with all you both say. Keep up the good fight against this disastrous war.

Mrs. ARTHUR D. NEWBOLD.

BETHLEHEM, PA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Saw you on TV last Sunday and today. The more we hear your voice the more we realize you stand for sanity in foreign relations. God give you strength to continue your constitutional protest. Upon you rests the very future of the United States. Be of good heart. There are millions behind you.

J. McFADDEN.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your stand on Vietnam.
Mr. and Mrs. EDWIN W. HALL.

February 9, 1966

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo for your insight, clarity, and courage
in today's proceedings.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. LAWRENCE CRANBERG.

CRAWFORD, NEBR.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator my thanks for your stand on let-
ting Americans know the facts.

Mrs. MARY S. MILLER.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.:

Hooray for you—no secret testimony.

Mrs. R. J. RYAN.

Mrs. PAT CARR.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for statement this morning re-
garding Secretary McNamara. We wish to
hear open hearings with the Secretary.
Would also like to know why Mr. Bell can
formulate what seems to be military tactics
or policy in the economic application of aid
in Vietnam.

CHARLES and HALINA MARGULIES.

CHICO, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully support your attitude on the cur-
rent investigations.

ANN ZWIEBEL.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator MORSE,

Care of Foreign Relations Committee, Senate
Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I heartily support your insistence that
the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary
of State be requested to testify before the
Senate Foreign Relations Committee in pub-
lic session. Keep up the good work.

HAROLD MOLENKAMV.

CORONADO, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My deep appreciation to you Senators
CASE, CHURCH, FULBRIGHT, CLARK, and PELL
for the genuine contribution each of you is
making toward better public understanding
of aid and our problems in southeast Asia
in the televised hearing. I share your concern
for the very reasons you have expressed.

Mrs. JOHN G. THOMPSON.

SHELburnE, VT.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Your views on Vietnam appear clear
and sound. Congratulations on your at-
tempt to bring Wheeler and McNamara be-
fore the Fulbright committee to defend and
clarify muddled U.S. policy in Vietnam.
Best wishes for a successful hearing.

The concerned citizens.

LORNA M. CROSS.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Wonderful work. I may move to Ore-
gon just to be your constituent. Letter fol-
lows.

Very truly yours,

W. N. L. BURBANK.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We citizens want to know the facts. Agree
with you no secrecy sessions for McNamara
in Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We
parents are very concerned. Our boys' lives
are at stake.

Mr. and Mrs. ANGELO J. MION.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I agree with you 100 percent. Keep it up.

Mrs. DAVID SOLOMON.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on stand against govern-
ment by secrecy—public hearing Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. A. J. HENRICH.

PINE BLUFF, ARK.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

For your good and courageous work I say
God bless you.

R. C. COURTLER.

WEBSTER GROVES, MO.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse open session McNamara-
Wheeler. People have right to know. Grate-
ful thanks to you.

Mr. and Mrs. ERWIN R. BLUMER.

WASHINGTON GROVE, MD.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily second your remarks this a.m.
Continue to insist on open hearing.

Mrs. ROBERT B. MYERS.

SAGINAW, MICH.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep meetings open to public. Your Re-
publican friends.

HAROLD and DORA WEGNER.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have been listening to you on TV. I am
in hearty accord with your position respect-
ing keeping American public fully informed.
We need more staunch Asians like you to
watch this southeastern Asian situation most
carefully.

ROBERT J. DECKER.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator MORSE, we and I am sure millions
of other Americans, appreciate your stand
against the Pentagon's refusal to appear be-
fore open session on the war policy in Viet-
nam. Along with many others we are
exceedingly concerned with growing secrecy
of the U.S. policy. I sincerely hope the
American public will continue to watch the
program and see for themselves which Sen-
ators will be outspoken and refuse to become
a stereotype. Congratulations.

Mr. and Mrs. FOSTER C. HOWELL.

TULSA, OKLA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Viewing hearing this a.m. Commend you on
your stand, appreciate your efforts.

Mr. and Mrs. DOUGLAS KINCAID.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As puzzled taxpayer, support
your protest regarding Pentagon refusal to
testify in public on Vietnam war prosecution.

JOHN AATON.

GARDEN GROVE, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I thank God for your stand, wish we had
more like you.

Mrs. O. L. RAINEY.

WORCESTER, PA.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your long arduous years and
courageous work for peace.

NICOLA and WALTON GEIGER.

BUTLER, PA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding TV broadcast February 4, 1966.
Bravo. Perhaps the reason so many young
people are rebelling today is because they're
smart enough to want all the facts. The
overworked, underrated, long-paying parent
is worried, too. May God give you strength
to continue such wisdom in this troubled
world.

Mrs. EARL BARTHOLOWMEW.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Commend your stand against government
by secrecy. Vietnam came without public
debate.

HOWARD ROLLMAN.

BLOOMINGTON, IND.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to you, to Senator FUL-
BRIGHT and others in your courageous stand.
The hearings which you implemented are
most valuable, informative. It is high time
the policymakers were held accountable for
their questionable and secret policies to the
American public who are paying dearly in
men and money. You have my full support.

LORRAINE SARAH.

February 9, 1966

nam debacle. We have been and will continue to support you and your position in the future. May you continue as a solid supporter toward peace.

ANGELINE and CARL SANDELL.

LA GRANDE, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Want McNamara and Wheeler testify publicly.

JAMES and JOETTA CLINE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We are with you 100 percent, just as we have been in the past.

BOB and CHARLOTTE BONHAM.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Good work. Make them answer. Doing a swell job. Saw you on TV.

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE MILLER.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your continuous efforts to change Vietnam policy and your resolution to rescind Gulf of Tonkin mandate.

NATIONAL STUDENT CHRISTIAN FEDERATION POLITICAL COMMISSION.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
You are truly great. And have our complete support. Keep up the fine work.

Mr. and Mrs. WINDSOR CALKINS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
DEAR SENATOR: Been listening to you on TV. Thanks. We're behind you 100 percent.

HARRY ANDERSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on the progress you are making to preserve legality in government. Illegality by Government officials is far more reprehensible than that of the private citizen. Every public servant in a democracy should be willing to account to the people for his official acts.

K. C. TANNER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Thank you for your position on Vietnam. You have this family's full support.

Mr. and Mrs. PHIL FICKABAUGH.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on boycotting secret meetings on Vietnam. You respect and protect our democratic traditions. Johnson and McNamara do not. You will live in history as great and good, they will not. Can we help?

LEAH and ELIZABETH DREWS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 5, 1966

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Solidly support your stand on public review of U.S. policy in southeast Asia. You are asking questions we Americans want answered.

Mr. and Mrs. R. L. BROWN

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 5, 1966

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations etv al adapted to Senate hearings.

VIRGINIA WAGNER

ANGOLA, N.Y.,
February 5, 1966

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your statements during televised Senate committee Vietnam hearings today were impressive. Share your concerns and strongly support position demanding open hearings with Defense and State Department heads. Public entitled fuller disclosures rejection of open hearings suspect. Keep probing include CIA need stronger congressional supervision and fewer secret moves by appointees.

L. B. HIMMEL.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Just heard your comments on television and I agree with you 100 percent. The country needs you.

A taxpayer and voter.

Mrs. ERCEL HARBY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We did not vote for you last time but now are sorry we did not for we admire both your stand and your stalwartness. Continue to insist on a full debate both in the Senate and United Nations.

Dr. and Mrs. GEORGE P. LYMAN.

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Keep up the good work.

LOUISE L. FORREST.

EAST ALTON, ILL.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your insistence that McNamara and Wheeler appear before the Fulbright committee in public. Keep up your good work.

Mrs. LEONA KLASNER.

TULSA, OKLA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree American people must be informed of the conditions concerning the protection of our country.

Mrs. FRANK MCCELIAN CROOKES.

LAKE PLACID, FLA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations to you for your interest in the American taxpayers and their Republic.

What this country needs is more statesmen like yourself. Best regards.

Mrs. JOHN SACEMAN.

POCATELLO, IDAHO,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Good for you. Hope others back you in demanding open hearing by Rusk and McNamara.

Mrs. AUDRA DELASHMUTT.

WESTBORO, MASS.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your good work in Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Cheers! Cheers! Cheers!

Rev. HENRY H. WIESBAUER.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I heard with great pleasure your remarks in the committee hearing this morning. I wish I were able to come to Washington to shake your hand. It is a real joy to find someone who thinks as I do. I wouldn't have missed it for a thousand dollars.

With real sincerity,

ROYCE R. BROWN.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks to NBC we have heard the morning session of the Foreign Relations Committee. Oregon is fortunate to have you represent them in such a courageous way. Many of us in Minnesota feel that you speak for us also. Just want to express our thanks.

Mr. and Mrs. STANLEY R. BERGLUND.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We and growing numbers of reasonable people support your courageous stand against continuing senseless immoral Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. MILES CAHN.

KLAMATH, CALIF.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand. No closed doors re foreign policy or other Government policies.

JOHN and BETTY WHITE.

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Stand firm.

CHARLES and GLADYS DE LA VERGNE.

BOWLING GREEN, OHIO,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for your stand regarding government by secrecy. Thank God.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT SNYDER.

BOWLING GREEN, OHIO,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for your stand regarding Government by secrecy. Thank God.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT SNYDER.

February 9, 1966

EAST ORANGE, N.J.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Hitler was just another political hack until he dissolved the Reichstag. Democracy as well as peace appears at stake in your hearings.

C. KELSEY, JR.

VANCOUVER, WASH.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You can be assured of more aid in your efforts to save our Nation and world from destruction.

EUGENE VAN TREES.

ORLANDO, FLA.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding McNamara's reluctance to appear on a public hearing with you and your committee, I am in favor of your approach, give him the ax.

JACK BRATTON.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo, on your stand against secret sessions and fighting without formal declaration of war. Wish more leaders had your guts and common sense. Particularly glad you were on TV for millions to see and hear because, unfortunately, many brainwashed newspapers conveniently omitted it from their report of the proceedings.

Mrs. L. A. SAYER.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support congressional debates. Keep up good work. Get our boys out of Vietnam.

Mrs. TALBERT SMITH.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 6, 1966.Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the war in Vietnam and support and appreciate your efforts to end it.

CAROL MARKLEY.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
February 6, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We are grateful for your strong voice. We support you and trust you will hold fast.

Mr. and Mrs. DAVID B. GRIFFITHS.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 6, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the bombing in North Vietnam. I support your efforts to prevent war.

JEFFREY HORN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 6, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your valiant fight for sanity and decency in our foreign policy.

Mrs. B. MULLEN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 6, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your position on Vietnam war. Please inform American people of U.S. mistakes.

RICHARD CALENDAR.

STOUGHTON, MASS.,
February 3, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your forthright stand on the Vietnam war.

PERRY AND ELEANOR OSTROFF.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
February 6, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your courageous stand on Vietnam.

J. E. BERGER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It's about time someone did something about Vietnam. I agree with your views.

ABRAHAM MOCITZ.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please force McNamara to testify before the committee. Tired of secrecy in our officials.

Mr. and Mrs. J. F. DAVIDSON.

BREA, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept our support in your fight against government by secrecy.

LARRY and SHARON DEAN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

Heartiest congratulations on your effort to halt the useless slaughter of our young generation and waste of our resources. China is the dominant power in Asia as we are in the Americas. Let us contain communism here in our hemisphere and the western part of Europe with which we have been allied for years. Also get rid of the two mistakes in the cabinet, Rusk and McNamara for the many mistakes they made and their highhanded attitude. Let us not promote them but fire them. The public is aware and concerned about not being consulted in such grave matters.

Mr. and Mrs. L. P. KENT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Many, many of us continue to support your stand against this immoral war in Vietnam.

CHARLOTTE GRUNIG.

ROANOKE, VA.,
February 6, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

We are at war so why not declare it and fight to win instead of spending our men and money on a situation that could go on for-

even or get out of Vietnam we could also avoid a raise in taxes and great stress to our economy by really cutting foreign aid and the ridiculous socialistic giveaway program. At home McNamara should be forced to testify and come out with the truth for a change. Respectfully submitted.

Mrs. CHARLES E. VIA, JR.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your devotion toward our beloved country and people is exemplary. My admiration for your wisdom.

MALVINA ROTH.

STANFORD, CONN.,
February 5, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We cheer your effort to end Government by secrecy and to halt this immoral war.

EDITH and HOWARD FRENCH.

GLENCOE, ILL.,
February 6, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for your outspoken, sane stand on Vietnam and your defense of our liberties.

Mrs. HAROLD FREEMAN.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.,
February 6, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your views on Vietnam, applaud your courage, and urge debate for good of our country.

W. A. and JANE SCHELLENBERG.

VERNAL, UTAH,
February 5, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work. Vitally necessary Congress regain its power usurped by the President.

CLAYTON SIMMONS.

FARGO, N. DAK.,
February 5, 1966.Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your fortitude to determine the facts in the Vietnam crisis.

ORAL A. HOLM.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work. Give our regards to the other supporting Senators.

ALVIN AYERS.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
February 7, 1966.Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your stand on telecast January 30.

PAUL and DOROTHY SCHWEIKHER.

EUGENE, OREG.,
January 4, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We were grateful and pleased at your part in the interrogation of Mr. Bell of AID in regards to the position you take on the Viet-

February 9, 1966

crisis this is not an overstatement. I felt that not only the great American family but indeed the members of your committee as acknowledged by them must have profited from the deeply reflective and extremely competent appraisals and judgments of General Gavin whose intellectual courage is surely a match for his professional endowment and distinction. Please do not take valuable time of yourself or staff to acknowledge this wire. I would deeply appreciate it if you would see that copies were channelled to at least Senator FULBRIGHT and General Gavin. Today "America, the beautiful" became "America in democracy and sanity the beautiful."

IRVING CAESAR.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks and congratulations for insisting on full and public debate on unconstitutional Vietnam war. And what do you think about President Johnson going to Honolulu to meet General Ky whose reported hero is Adolph Hitler?

F. E. OWEN.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The Nation is rooting for you and Senator FULBRIGHT. Don't give up until you have questioned the McNamaras and all the rest. The people expect and trust you to bring them all to account for the tragedy they brought on this country. Even Hawaii should not be too far to bring them to answer.

MRS. CECILE MAIN.

VANCOUVER, WASH.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Hope you can flush out McNamara. Keep up the good work.

EVERETT E. STEP.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thousands Texans grateful you, FULBRIGHT, GRUENING, sane legislators. Stand against Federal support ugly Viet dictatorship.

BEATRICE M. ROSNER.

BROCKTON, MASS.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I heartily agree with your thoughts on our senseless war in Vietnam.

ROSE LICHMAN.

BROCKTON, MASS.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand protesting our involvement in Vietnam.

WILLIAM NAGLE.

BROCKTON, MASS.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand in opposition to the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

MRS. NORMAN LIEBER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 6, 1966

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

We are with you wholeheartedly in topic televised 4th of February, 1966.

SHIRLEY and NAIL PAYZA.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you vote to rescind President Johnson's emergency powers.

HARRY J. GLASSCOCK.

NEW YORK, N.Y., February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your fight to reestablish control over Presidential prerogatives is vital to our future as a democratic Nation. We support your criticisms of this illegal and immoral and unwise war.

Mr. and Mrs. A. H. EDELMAN.

TACOMA, WASH., February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your magnificent stand for sanity and peace and your rejection of secret government.

Dr. HAROLD BASS.

CARBONDALE, ILL., February 5, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The term "courage" is most often used when heady speculation in the balance of power has netted dubious national glorification while sacrificing the principles of international law and justice. In your heart authentic courage linked with truth foresees a new and healthier view of ourselves. Our generation has seen no finer congressional inspiration.

LARRY R. CAUGHRON,
WILLIAM E. KNAPP,
MICHAEL L. HARTY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your attempt to stop Johnson, Rusk, and McNamara from continuing their war in Vietnam.

ETHELWYN STEERE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly endorse your attempts to examine Johnson's executive war. Urge you to continue.

LEITH SPEDDEN.

MINEOLA, N.Y.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I enjoyed watching the Senate hearings yesterday. Mr. Bell seemed to be very honest. You, Senator, were very astute. When is Secretary of Defense McNamara taking the stand?

LILLIAN WEGLEGE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am completely in support of your policy on the Vietnam war.

MRS. ELIZABETH JONES.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Make McNamara testify. Public entitled to entire truth. Call Bundy, Lodge, and Lyndon if necessary.

Mr. and Mrs. MARTIN ELFANT.

MADISON, WIS.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You were magnificent on TV. Please keep up your good work.

MRS. DAVIS SYFTESTAD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Am in full accord with your stand on Vietnam.

J. DANIEL E. CHIU.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

It has been a long time since so many nice things have been said about one man and what a man. Congratulations.

JUDY LEVITT.

TORRANCE, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are proud of your stand on Vietnam and necessity for public debate. Congratulations.

R. A. and ELIZABETH BALLINGER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support criticism of Government by secrecy. Urge open Vietnam hearings in Foreign Relations Committee.

VINCENT and AGNES O'DONELL.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The undersigned heartily concur with your views on the Vietnam situation.

Make the administration differentiate between Communist nations with regard to their actual behavior as nations, not what isolated members of those nations may say in public. Let the administration not forget that certain American politicians have made exceedingly belligerent public statements in the past. No nation is without nonrepresentational voices.

It is a time needful of the congressional discussion of facts not decisions made secretly, of farsighted internationalism, not insecure shortsighted jingoism.

PETER E. HAIMAN,
PAULA J. THOMAS.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for men like yourself and Senator FULBRIGHT who have courage of their convictions. Who can I help.

Sincerely,

MRS. DORIS N. GLENN.

February 9, 1966

ALTADENA, CALIF.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on stand opposing
Vietnam war. We must stop senseless
slaughter of Vietnamese and Americans.
Mrs. GERTRUDE KLAUSE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Heartily support your opposition to Viet-
nam policy. Hope you will continue your
courageous stand.

OLGA GECHAS.

BRENTWOOD, CALIF.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I fervently support your action and view
in regard to Vietnam policy.

NATHAN FISHER,
Brentwood Pharmacy.

DAYTON, OHIO,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I heartily agree with your views on our
unfortunate involvement in Vietnam, on the
right of American people to know how taxes
are spent, on State and Defense Departments.
Many Americans grateful to you and Sen-
ators GRUENING, FULBRIGHT, and others con-
cerned for humanity. Your reply today to
President excellent.

MARGARET STEINDORF.

BELLEVUE, WASH.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
American people need to be reminded our
military might did not force on China the
government we chose for her. It only
changed China from friend to enemy. We
applaud your effort to show who it is that
is blind to experience in Asia.

Mr. and Mrs. PATON B. CROUSE.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You represent not Oregon but thoughtful
Americans everywhere as you fight TN. God
bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. ROSCOE HILL and STEPHEN.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
February 8, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: You have our continuing support for
your courageous and forceful stand in oppos-
ing executive military adventures. In par-
ticular we support your stand on the Vietnam
military involvement.

We extend our personal regards as former
constituents and Salem-Oregonians.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT E. EYRE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: We applaud your position
on Vietnam war. Please continue the fight
with our wholehearted support.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. ISIDOR SCHLANGER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We are in support of your stand on Ameri-
can foreign policy in Vietnam.
Dr. and Mrs. MARTIN ROSHCO.

STATE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:
Our admiration, gratitude, and support for
your accurate appraisal of the Vietnam mess
and the administration's attempts to keep
this from the public.

PAUL C. SHAW,
JAMES W. CLARK.

St. LOUIS, Mo.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Keep up the gallant effort. Your questions
are helping the people see the truth.
GARNET BLAKE.

SHELBYVILLE, KY.,
February 6, 1966.

Hon Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:
Public Foreign Relations Committee hear-
ings are reestablishing the authority of Con-
gress. Press hard for public testimony from
Rusk, McNamara and others. Our Nation's
greatness is badly marred by this illegal and
unnecessary war on a small nation. Our in-
volvement there is bad world leadership.
W. FOREST SMITH.

JAMAICA, N.Y., February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We share your deep concern with the di-
rection of U.S. involvement in Vietnam.
Agree that there should be discussion and
reevaluation of our policy. The stopping of
bombing of North Vietnam and negotiations
with the national liberation front are vital
factors. All measures to bring peace should
be investigated.

JAMAICA COMMITTEE FOR SANE
NUCLEAR POLICY.

DES MOINES, IOWA, February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We are for you.

QUESTION and LEONTINE HILL.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Heartily agree your feeling and views re
public appearance McNamara and Wheeler
before your committee.
For sake of American people please pursue
this to maximum length.

ED. E. WALSH.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We favor your investigation of our involve-
ment in the Vietnam war, we agree with your
views on the war and urge you continue your
fight against it.

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD BELIKOFF.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Support your stand against Vietnam war

and oppose sending Americans to fight
against their will.

EDWARD DE WATH.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Keep up protest wholeheartedly support
pulling troops out Vietnam war.

GENE BERNARDI.

AUSTIN, TEX.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We approve and support your views on
Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. C. J. ZERN.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Our family appreciated the patriotic stand
you have taken on Vietnam. Thank you for
your effort. We back your opinions.
The DALE CARGILL Family.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Hall your leadership in fighting for peace
in Vietnam. Approve fully a public hearing.
RUTH LOWENKRON,
Queen Anne Democratic Club.

MAPLE HEIGHTS, OHIO,
February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on Vietnam public hearing
stand. All Americans, indeed all world in-
volved when American blood flows. We all
have need to know effects.

Dr. and Mrs. JOHN SABOL.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Heartily endorse and support your resolu-
tion to withdraw the Tonkin Bay resolution
of August 1964. We agree that President
Johnson must not be allowed further use
of this resolution to escalate the war in
Vietnam.

DR. PAUL OLYNYK,
Chairman, Cleveland Sane.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:
Your judgment and wisdom on the war
are unexcelled. Keep up your good work.
We can win only by getting out of Vietnam.
WILLIAM FLETCHER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Because on one or two occasions we met
this is addressed to you and meant of course
to be shared with Senator FULBRIGHT and the
members of the committee. I am despite the
length of this message speechless and
almost tearful in appreciation of the day's
hearings. With millions of others I wit-
nessed the apotheosis of the American
dream. Democracy at work, come alive. I
believe it has been one of the brightest days
in the history of our legislators in the role
of public servants. Considering the time of

February 9, 1966

We have a conscience and would rather die in brotherhood and poor than have the horror of continued American aggressions on our conscience.

VIRGINIA DOWNES.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The whole question of our Asian policy may be at last investigated. Support for your position is widening daily.

STEVEN HLADIS,
JAMES SCHULER,
FLORA STERNER,
LIFE ANDERSEN,
EDWARD MELCARTH,
DANIEL BROWN,
WILLIAM TARMAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support you completely in your efforts to end war.

FAMILY R. ARON.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,

February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate and actively support open debate on U.S. foreign policy.

Thank you.

DAVID WEAVER FAMILY.

EVANSTON, ILL.,

February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your views on Vietnam 100 percent, I thank God for your courage.

Mrs. LLOYD L. SHANKS.

LOS GATOS, CALIF.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

1. Proud of your stand on Vietnam war Poan 1633 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 6, D.C., tells us its religious war is mostly Buddhists versus few Catholics.

We believe in religious freedom. Do our war leaders? Surely there is a better way.

2. Please vote for cable TV up McKenzie River. Few get any good TV why deny us any clear TV? In FCC now.

GENEVRA DAVIS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Get copy of miracle plan solutions to Viet crisis from Fulbright.

OLIVER H. PERREAULT.

DETROIT, MICH.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your reply to President's speech in Hawaii expresses my own thoughts. You have my support.

ARNOLD SABAROFF.

MERCED, CALIF.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I do not approve of the President's policy of escalation in Vietnam.

HARRY WOOLSEY.

LANSING, MICH.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for your courageous answer to the President. We are those millions who were hoodwinked by his peace platform, however there is strong undercurrent among Democrats for no confidence vote for those supporting this administration's naked aggression and two faced policy.

STANLEY H. SHIIP.

WILMINGTON, DEL.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: May I respectfully suggest Contours of American History by William Appleton Williams, pages 422 and on, as a source of reference for relations with China past and present. If the mayor with this work good thank God and a few brave men for some truth about present policies of our Government.

F S. LOGUE

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,

February 8, 1966

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for courage above and beyond the call of duty. You are not alone.

Mrs. BETTY FERREIRA.

HAYWARD, CALIF.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Warmly applaud Foreign Relations Committee and you especially for exposing Johnson's tragic folly in Vietnam.

Ed and VIRGINIA PEEL.

LONGMONT, COLO.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your persistence of investigation of Vietnam policy.

PEACE PROMOTERS.

SOYSSET, N.Y.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations and many thanks for your mockery statement. We resent Presidential welcome to South Vietnamese dictators and his debasement of American name and peace intentions.

Mr. and Mrs. E. R. STABLER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

February 8, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the pressure. Your efforts are indispensable.

DAVID M. CALLAHAM.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your position on Vietnam; make administration tell us when this fiasco will end.

J. SPIRER.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The President had no right to commit us

to the Vietnam war. The right to declare war is a legislative power and cannot be delegated to anyone else by Congress. President had no moral right to deliberately waste American lives in a useless, meaningless war which no one wants. Only a courageous stand will prevent the national catastrophe which is facing us. Keep up the good work.

HENRY AND SARAH DU LAURENCE.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your courage in taking such a courageous stand against the Johnson-Rusk foreign policy. Please continue to be the conscience of our country.

Mr. and Mrs. IRA STEIN and family.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are one American that has the courage to stand against the warmakers. I support you.

GERTRUDE R. ANDERSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

February 8, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your efforts to obtain an open hearing on our policies in Vietnam and are so advising our two Senators.

Mr. and Mrs. HOWARD L. HOOVER.

POMONA, CALIF.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position on Vietnam 100 percent and urge that you do your best to get McNamara in open session before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee so that all Americans can know what's going on in Vietnam.

AL. RAMPERSHAD,

HUGO CELAYA,

JACK MORNOE,

SAM LASALA,

School Teachers.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your speech deploring resumption of bombing. Urge strenuous opposition to illegal administration position.

GIFFARD.

SEACLIFF, N.Y.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Hold firm. Thank you and God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. J. E. ISBELL.

DETROIT, MICH.,

February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your courageous response to President Johnson's slur on the peace forces of the Nation. You are an inspiration in your struggle for a real congressional debate. You are representing not just Oregon but all of us who don't want to see a nuclear war and perhaps the end of civilization. Thank you and keep up your brave struggle.

JOHN G. CONLEY.

February 9, 1966

LAFAYETTE, IND.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. You have just stated the minds of millions of Americans regarding open hearings. Stand by your convictions.
WALTER E. KLINKER.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
December 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I watched you this morning on TV. I agree with you and I thank you for your time and I appreciate what you think. You are for us and our taxpayers. I am a Hoosier agreeing with an Oregon Senator.
S. P. SHERRIN.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I watched you on TV. Think you right.
JOHN McLAUGHLIN.

BRAINTREE, MASS.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily concur with televised remarks regarding secrecy. Congratulations on courage.
CLARA CULLEN DONATELLO.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with you. Stand your ground.
Mr. and Mrs. J. G. HAMMOND.

BROOKLINE, MASS.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you very much for your courage. God bless you.
Dr. and Mrs. WILFRED CALMAS.

UTICA, N.Y.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your open committee hearings. Keep pushing.
JOHN PULCINI.

PENTH AMBOY, N.J.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Three cheers your stand against closed sessions for McNamara and Wheeler. Please give my congratulations to Senator CASE supporting you.
JAMES T. BIRCHALL.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,
January 4, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Please, for sake of people, do all you can to get McNamara in public session.
Mrs. SCHERER.

ORLANDO, FLA.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work in your debate. We Americans are behind you.
DELORES KENDALL.

CALABASAS, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Many mature responsible people back your views on Vietnam. We cannot have compassion and support needless slaughter. I am at your service.
Mrs. CLAUDE (PAT) SMITH.

PUTNAM, CONN.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Lust for power in White House. Protect our country. Stop war. Stop spending. Close pocketbook.
Mr. and Mrs. CAPELLETTE.

COLLEGE STATION, TEX.,
December 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Your views on secrecy in Government. Can David Bell issue a direct reply? Please keep plugging you're our brightest hope yet.
Mr. and Mrs. PETER D. WEINER.

WILTON, CONN.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Your words condemning Government by secrecy refusing to allow McNamara, Wheeler, and Rusk to testify secretly should be cast in bronze a mile high. Our country is in bad trouble. We, the people, want to know why and how so we can do what is necessary to get back to a free, open constitutional Government. Letter follows.
Respectfully,
WARD M. STERLING.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We were exceedingly interested and share your views that the American public should be thoroughly informed on the true picture of all the facets regarding the escalating war in Vietnam.
Mr. and Mrs. J. D. BALDRIDGE.

LODI, CALIF.,
January 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your views on illegal war in Vietnam.
Mr. and Mrs. CLIFTON J. PRATT.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your effort to force congressional investigation of undeclared Vietnam war. Good work.
Dr. and Mrs. K. N. TANNER.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We are proud of your stand on Vietnam. Don't let the brutes grind you down.
Mrs. RUTH BUEHLER.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your stand on Vietnam in best American tradition of freedom and dissent. We support you wholeheartedly.
THERESE AND CHARLES CORMACK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Tonight on TV we were proud of you.
WARDEN McDONALD AND FAMILY.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you for Viet stand. Continue to speak out. Save us from war III.
MARY ROBBINS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have just heard your clear precise analysis on television. Thank heaven the voice of sanity can still be heard. I wish you were our Senator from New York.
ROBERT SCURLOCK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are appalled at President Johnson's airport speech and militant policies and we applaud and fully back the comments you made about it on television. You have courageously represented the truth about Vietnam from the beginning and millions of us from Maine to Hawaii give you our allegiance and gratitude for your fine work.
Mr. and Mrs. THOMAS J. KNOWLES.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We approve your stand on Vietnam. We believe that you represent the hopes of millions of Americans to stop the war in Vietnam and the danger of escalation into a suicidal world war. We look to you in our hope that we will not be led into a dictatorship.
Respectfully,
H. MARCUS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May God grant you strength to continue your loyal opposition and your courageous fight against this illegal war. We support your bill to rescind the blank check resolution passed at time of Tomkin Gulf incident.
Mr. and Mrs. I. R. NEUGEBAUER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Representing many silent Americans, may I take the liberty of expressing our spirits in asking you to continue your courageous stand in Congress for your country and for so many Americans who look to you for leadership? You have been brave in expressing our conviction. We are not weak. We love our boys who are dying in the Asian land war. Please, Mr. Congressman, financial interest are keeping Americans like me and my silent friends quiet when American motives are being challenged by the world. Maybe we are not the money conscious people the world takes us to be. We have a choice of financial loss—higher taxes and more American boys dying, or the loss of some countries. We never belonged in E.G., Australia, the Philippines, and Hawaii and the loss of revenue in those countries.

February 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2493

WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations your recent stimulating
speech regarding Vietnam.

Capt. JOHN S. BURROWS.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Press for McNamara public hearing, American
role on foreign aid. Appreciate your attitude
and concern.

Mrs. GEORGE R. WEAVER.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept our thanks for your intelligent,
courageous, sane views on Vietnam.

DAVID and ELLEN PATRICK.

LOS GATOS, CALIF.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

For the sake of the lives of our boys and
welfare of all mankind we heartily endorse
your opposition to President Johnson's policy
in Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. GEORGE A. MURCH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations and heartfelt thanks for
your magnificent stand against that obscenity
in the White House who should be impeached.
How proud Oregon and Alaska must be of their
Senators who show such integrity of mind. How
I wish New York could feel the same about their
Senators.

PHYLLIS LLEWELLYN.

BRIGANTINE, N.J.,
February 8, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Approve unqualifiedly your challenging
statements to the President. Have we forgotten
Eisenhower's farewell address when he warned
us to beware of the military industrial complex.

PAUL M. COPE.

DUQUOIN, ILL.,
February 8, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

You have demonstrated an unquestionable
concern regarding a matter of serious consequence
to every inhabitant on earth. Through the public
hearings on foreign relations you have made it
possible for many to object or agree with U.S.
policy while having reasonable understanding of
the facts.

Thank you, Senator.

MARTIN A. ODOM.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
February 8, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My wife and I wholeheartedly support the
inquiry into the administration policy in the
Vietnam war. We believe the Nation's foreign
policy needs to be evaluated to determine
whether it is really furthering the democratic
ideals that this country is sup-

posed to stand for in such places as Vietnam
and the Dominican Republic and with hindsight,
Cuba.

ROBERT L. REYNOLDS.

KALAMAZOO, MICH.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your Vietnam policy.
Mr. and Mrs. KENNETH IRISH

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you.

ROBERT M. MESSINGER.

FAIRFIELD, CALIF.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your bringing before
the public an intellectual discussion of the
Vietnam situation. Also please extend
congratulations to General Gavin for his
outstanding efforts on behalf of our country.

DONALD G. VINZANT.

PENNYAN, N.Y.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend you and agree completely
with your statements of concern over the
speech given by President Johnson, in
Hawaii. Regarding Vietnam. Please keep
your sensible statements coming to the public.
Although your statements are in disagreement
with the strategy advocated by President
Johnson and advisers, it is only through
dissent that the democratic process can
survive.

MARGUERITE and DAVID PFEIFFER.

STOWE, Vt.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Very interested in discussions of South
Vietnam. No one I have discussed this
problem with from Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania,
New Jersey, New York, Vermont. Have agreed
with administration policy. That is Congress
should decide if we're going to engage
in a war let our Representatives decide it.
In other words I agree with you implicitly.

JOHN H. CHAMBERS.

KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I find thousands of Tennesseans believing
that the legislative branch of the U.S. Government
should act in behalf of citizens in war
declaration and war actions and not the
executive branch of U.S. Government. The
people are beginning to question why 400
men should be elected to the legislative
branch of the Government since their judgment
and actions are relegated to the judgment
and actions of 12 men in the executive
branch of the Government. Why the 12
judgment predominating instead of the 400
judgment. Us people elected and depend
upon to act for us under U.S. Constitution.

R. E. CARROLL GRAY.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept my thanks and encouragement
for the Vietnam hearings. This open
discussion is past due; hope the American

people will learn about the terrible prospects
of escalation and find a way with your guidance
for an honorable settlement.

LEONARD ZWETG.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your stand on Vietnam. Please
continue cry out against this illegal war.

MARION and JEROME B. LINDEN.

DEERFIELD, ILL.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We have sent telegrams tonight to the
President, to our Senators, and our Representatives
asking for a change in our Vietnam policy.
We applaud your efforts to restore sanity
to our foreign policy. You are a beacon of
hope in a sea of despair.

A. J. SCHAPS.

LOS GATOS, CALIF.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your speech exposing Johnson hypocrisy
in Honolulu was great, you have our gratitude
and support.

Dr. and Mrs. ROBERT W. FAN BRUGGEN.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up resistance to administration
insane Vietnam policy.

SYBIL STICHT.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Thanks for your American approach of
February 4. My regards to your supporters.

GENE H. PARRISH.

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Bravo for you in speaking
up for the American people. There isn't anything
going on in a foreign country that is worth
one American life. Charity and aid belong
at home first and with all that is needed
here in America I think it about time we
have the proper representation such as you
so openly and unafraidably give.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA KENDALL, (Mrs. G. H.)

HILLSDALE, N.J.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo, keep up the good work. I admire
your stand on Vietnam.

Mrs. FRED SCARANO.

GREENVILLE, N.C.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand for the
secrecy on the Vietnam conflict for a confused
citizen.

ELWOOD R. EDWARDS.

nel we so desperately need to combat crime and fire in our Nation's Capital, and furthermore, it will help to retain the qualified men already serving their community.

I firmly believe that this pay increase must be an essential part of any program to reduce crime in our Nation's Capital.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to give this legislation their strongest support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2910) to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, and the White House Police, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO FILE SUNDRY REPORTS DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be permitted to file sundry reports during the recess of the Senate.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] may be added to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators CLARK and SPARKMAN be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 130) to establish May 8 to May 14, 1966, as National School Safety Patrol Week.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 1, 1966, the names of Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SCOTT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2857) to increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH) on February 1, 1966.

NOTICE 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 Judi-

ciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 17, 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.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM K. THOMAS TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 17, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William K. Thomas, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of Ohio, vice Paul Jones, deceased.

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 Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

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. CHURCH:

Address entitled "Farming in Idaho: A Look Ahead," delivered by him at the farm-city banquet of the Kiwanis Club of Twin Falls, Idaho.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Editorial in tribute to the late Henry Y. Kasal, published in the Salt Lake Tribune of February 1, 1966.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

Article entitled "New England's Big Comeback, Latest Success Story," published in the U.S. News & World Report of February 7, 1966.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Poem entitled "God Out of School," by Gene Rickett, dealing with the recognition of God in public and private lives.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Article entitled "Thais Expanding Armed Strength," written by Hanson W. Baldwin and published in the New York Times of February 4, 1966.

STRANGE TYPE OF MALARIA FEVERS AFFLICTS OUR SOLDIERS IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in Vietnam, Okinawa, Japan, and at Clark Air Base near Manila the hospitals of our Armed Forces are jammed with wounded and sick from Vietnam. Many

GI's are being terribly wounded in jungle "booby traps" so concealed as to escape detection even if extreme care is exercised. The ratio of our wounded to those killed in combat is about 10 to 1 because of these tactics. Our fine young soldiers fighting in Vietnam are afflicted with malaria of such a virulent nature that modern medical science has been hard put to cure them. In fact, unfortunately, a number have died. Others are being honorably discharged by reason of physical disability. This form of malaria fever and other jungle fevers are taking a terrible toll.

The fact is that this vicious malarial strain is afflicting from 500 to 800 of our soldiers each month and is one of the greatest problems facing our military commanders and medical officers in Vietnam. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post of January 30, 1966, a United Press International news item entitled "Strange Type of Malaria in Vietnam Vexes Pentagon," setting forth this problem in detail. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

STRANGE TYPE OF MALARIA IN VIETNAM VEXES PENTAGON

A Vietnam jungle mosquito that breeds "upside down" is giving Defense Department doctors almost as much worry as wounds inflicted by Communist Vietcong guerrillas.

The insect is the anopheles bacabacensis. It carries a tough strain of malaria known as fulciparum. It is felling 500 to 700 U.S. soldiers a month in Vietnam war. It is immune to malaria drugs now available.

The Defense Department has launched a \$29 million crash program to develop an effective counteragent.

Unlike other mosquitoes, this jungle pest lays its eggs on the bottom of a tree leaf. Pesticides sprayed from the air leaves the anopheles bacabacensis untouched.

Two other strains that also apparently resist present antimalarial drugs have been uncovered in neighboring Thailand, adding to the Pentagon's worries.

The new kind of malaria also has played an important role in drastic increases in quinine and quidine prices. The increases and an apparent shortage of quinine are being studied by congressional investigators and the Federal Trade Commission.

Pentagon officials said the current incidence of cases involving the new malaria is moderate. But they expect it to increase as U.S. troops move into more severely infested Vietnam areas.

Some Pentagon planners were described as having an "absolute shaking fit" over the idea of a large number of troops being infected where they cannot be treated effectively.

Quinine has proved effective against some of the new cases. But military medical officials note that quinine can cause nausea and dizziness, thus hampering a soldier's ability to fight.

The researchers hope to develop a drug that would be effective both as a treatment and a preventive, similar to the chloroquine drug used against older malaria strains.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, while hospitalized, many of our young men are placed on temporary cots. Yet, at Oak Harbor and Fort Clinton, Ohio, two 200-bed field hospitals are stored and have been stored for civil defense purposes since 1958. This outrageous situa-

February 9, 1966

2492

tion is duplicated in other cities in Ohio and in other States. Officials of the Department of Defense should make use of such hospital beds and equipment instead of continually buying new equipment. The civil defense program has been a stupendous hoax and waste of considerably more than a billion dollars of taxpayers' money. This so-called civil defense shelter program is a huge boondoggle. The Soviet Union poses no threat of nuclear attack with intercontinental ballistic missiles. Its leaders seek coexistence. They are veering toward capitalism. No other nation has any capacity to assail us with nuclear warheads.

Mayor John Lindsey recently announced that he would abolish New York City Office of Civil Defense and said that scrapping it would mean a considerable saving for the city. Let us hope that other mayors and Governors follow this commonsense action of the mayor of New York. Finally, how can the Secretary of Defense continue to defend his waste of taxpayers' money for a civil defense shelter program which is so silly? Our efforts and money should be concentrated on saving lives of wounded GI's and those afflicted with malaria and other jungle diseases.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S TRIP TO SAIGON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the dispatch of the Vice President to Saigon and other capitals by the President.

It seems to me that recent events are now producing the American consensus on what should be done about Vietnam, and that this consensus falls into three categories:

First, to pursue the military effort within the present order of magnitude, but without escalation beyond that point.

Second, to pursue the effort to bring about a realization of the social revolution in Vietnam through an enhanced foreign aid program, and especially through the development of reforms such as sanitation, health, housing, food intake, and food supplies, with special emphasis on land tenure, because land reform in South Vietnam is very important.

Let us stop deluding ourselves about the government in Vietnam. Its military effort, with which we are associated requires that South Vietnamese reforms will have to be made on the basis of self-help and mutual cooperation. If the U.S. position there is to be tenable at all, the United States must insist upon reforms. The government in Saigon was not elected; it took power. It is impossible to do anything else, but it is also impossible to do anything else but engage in economic and social construction in Vietnam, and we must insist on it if we are to stay there.

The third part of the American consensus is to pursue the peace offensive with undiminished vigor, notwithstanding the fact that Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow have been so unreceptive.

I believe this is what the American people support. But the President

should add a fourth element to the consensus, and that is to invite backing by Congress and the people by sending an appropriate resolution to Congress updating the resolution of August 1964, in respect of Vietnam to meet the present situation.

The President is a good enough politician to know that he has nothing to fear; that he will receive an overwhelming vote. But it would associate the Congress with him in making this portentous decision for the American people.

I see too many fissures in the President's own party, as well as in the country, for the President not to take advantage of this great opportunity to consolidate the Congress and the country with him—and I emphasize that such a partnership is needed to pursue our purposes.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. JAVITS. No one is talking about victory. There is no one to vanquish. There are only objectives to attain. These objectives are embodied in the four-part consensus I have just mentioned.

Let me add one further point. When I returned from Vietnam some 3 weeks ago, I urged the President to give special attention to the real and underlying cause of war in Vietnam—social and economic privation. To meet this basic problem, I urged the President to place a top coordinator in charge of the aid program. He has done that. He could not have selected a better man than the Vice President. Now, the only action the President need take is to add the fourth point—namely, congressional action—which will show the support of the American people in such a way as to inspire the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

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

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

COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD certain telegrams, pro and con, which I have received in connection with my statements with respect to what I have said is the unconstitutional, illegal war in Vietnam, and to also insert my answers to the critical wires.

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

PORTLAND OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
First continue your stand on Vietnam.
Oregon voters back you. How can I help?
DOROTHY MCKENZIE.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on your efforts to expose the waste in our foreign aid efforts, and we confirm your judgment of getting out of the Vietnam war.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. RAY F. BAKER.

TILLAMOOK, OREG.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
May I please add my name to your growing list of Oregon voters re your Vietnam stand. I am

BOYD E. HARTMAN.

PORTLAND OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations and continued support to you, Governor Hatfield, and the Members of the Congress of the United States who seek peace rather than war. The war should be on poverty and disease, not the creator of both as in Vietnam.

NONA GLAZER.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Behind you 100 percent. Keep up your work to end the war now.

Mr. and Mrs. PETER SHROYER.

KENILWORTH, ILL.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Can I as an individual help stop this madness in Vietnam with my best individual cooperation. Our double-talking President is getting completely out of hand.

H. H. HANLON.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Salute your courage and strength on Vietnam war opposition. Please don't be pressured into silence.

LAURA BOCK.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
DEAR SIR: We support your voiced opinions 100 percent. Listening to televised investigation with full attention. Be assured of Oregon's support Democrat and Republicans as this family represents.

Sincerely,

Mrs. H. E. HOWARD.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:
Bravo. Stay in there and pitch.

MAC BROWN.

show that a cutback in the program will mean a decrease in school milk consumption. There simply is no way to get around this fact.

Yet the program has been cut by 10 percent this year, both because insufficient funds were appropriated by Congress and because the Bureau of the Budget in a completely phony economy move has withheld some of the funds that were appropriated. The administration plans to cripple the program even more next year—cutting it to one-fifth its former size and imposing an onerous means test on those who receive milk under the program.

I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention this morning a study made by the University of Illinois College of Agriculture in 1960 that indicates the value of the program in increasing milk consumption. The report states:

In the first 5 years the special milk program was in operation, consumption per student in Illinois increased 2½ times.

Certainly this shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that full funding of the school milk program is essential if student milk consumption is to continue at its present high level.

The study reiterates this point by stating:

If the school milk program were not in operation, the student price would frequently be as much as 10 cents per half pint, and consumption in schools would be very likely to suffer a major decrease. The low student price made possible by the school milk program is one of the basic reasons for high consumption in schools.

As I understand the fiscal 1967 proposal to cut the program from \$103 million to \$21 million the intent is to support the disbursement of milk to the needy who would be chosen by the school administrator. Also, milk would continue to be provided under the program to schools not having a school lunch program. This means that millions of schoolchildren would for the first time pay more than 10 cents per half pint. I say more than 10 cents because the 1960 study of course does not reflect the price increases that have taken place in the intervening 5 years.

Mr. President, can anyone doubt the tremendous impact this will have on milk consumption? Can anyone seriously believe that millions and millions of children will not drop out of the program when the cost of having two half pints a day is \$1 a week? And among these children will be those who are too proud to qualify themselves as poverty cases or not quite poor enough to be chosen to receive welfare milk from the Federal Government.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE AND THE VIETNAM DEBATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, an editorial which appeared in the February 5, 1966, edition of the Washington Post points up, as I have done in my Vietnam report, the close parallel between the current U.S. policy in Vietnam and the Truman doctrine. Then, as now, the critics felt that the doctrine was aggressive and open ended, that it would lead

to and escalate wars. But, the doctrine was applied with caution and restraint, and it was "a peacemaking and not a warmaking doctrine."

I call the attention of my colleagues to this editorial and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on administration policies in South Vietnam ought to clarify opposing views and might even help in reconciling some differences on foreign policy. It is to be hoped that the committee's witnesses will grapple with the fundamentals in a way that the Congress did in 1947 when the country embarked upon the policies we have followed ever since.

The Truman doctrine was recognized in 1947 as a historic declaration. The President in his March 12 message to Congress said bluntly: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." The Congress and the country agreed with him and American aid was sent to Greece to back up the British in resisting the first of the wars of "national liberation" that have been a unique military and diplomatic phenomenon of our times. That resistance proved to be brilliantly successful and Greece and the Mediterranean were saved for the West. Since 1947 the pursuit of the policy then enunciated has led us into diplomatic and military confrontations around the globe—notably in Lebanon, the Congo, the Philippines, in Latin American countries, in Vietnam, and in the Suez crisis. If there is any constant thread in our foreign relations it is the resistance to subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. It has not been universally directed against Communists as such—it has been applied, with pain and reluctance, against the policies of even our best friends as it was at Suez.

We can see the wars and diplomatic confrontations the Truman doctrine has involved us in; but we cannot see the aggressions that we have not had to check because of knowledge in the world of the existence of the Truman doctrine. In the current debate on that doctrine—and that is what any meaningful debate will be about—the wars that have not happened ought to be remembered, as well as the trials that have afflicted us.

At the time the doctrine was embraced, it did not go unchallenged. Many Senators pointed out then that it might eventually involve us around the world—even in China as the late Senator Arthur Capper, for one, pointed out. And Walter Lippmann attacked the policy both in its application to Greece and in its worldwide implications. He described it as "a vague global policy which sounds like a tocsin of an ideological crusade that has no limits." And he deplored "entangling ourselves as partisans in a Greek civil war." The criticism was useful, for it resulted in a cautious and restrained application of the doctrine generally. And the critics were prophetic in seeing the far-reaching consequences of this policy.

The truth is that the Truman doctrine, like so many of the spunky President's utterances, came close to putting the national impulse into a single sentence. It reflected what Walter Lippmann had said in 1944 about the continuing and profound interest of Americans in conditions everywhere in the world. Lippmann called it this persistent evangel of Americanism. And he thought it reflected the fact that no nation, and certainly not this Nation, can endure in a

politically alien and morally hostile environment; and the profound and abiding truth that a people which does not advance its faith has already begun to abandon it. President Truman's March speech and Mr. Lippmann's global eloquence faithfully mirror the impulses of our countrymen. But at the same time, on alternate occasions and off days, this expansive inclination has been matched by caution and restraint and a sense of our limitations. Lippmann, in discussing U.S. war aims in 1944, expressed a widespread anxiety about the reach of American or Western power in Asia. "We must take it as decided," he said, "that the tutelage of the western empires in Asia is coming to its predestined end." And that was and is an authentic reflection of American judgment.

So the two impulses meet now in Vietnam and will manifest themselves in their curious contradictory way in the Senate hearings, no doubt. If the Senators are to have a fair chance of reconciling this dichotomy, they must remember that in application the Truman doctrine turned out to be a peacemaking and not a warmaking doctrine. Even in Greece, the object was to secure the freedom of Greece—not to produce a confrontation between the Soviet Union and the West. The trick then was to save Greece without having a war with the Soviet Union. And it was accomplished. The aim now ought to be to save South Vietnam without having a war with China. This is essentially the policy the administration is pursuing. It is the policy that the Senators will be examining. It is the Truman doctrine enunciated in March 1947—a doctrine that not all Americans have caught up with yet—nearly 20 years later.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on January 26, 1966, as appearing in the RECORD on pages 1166-1170, I discussed how this administration had conceived a questionable plan for raising campaign contributions from corporations by describing them as advertisements.

At that time I emphasized that the corporations making these contributions were in effect being subjected to political blackmail, particularly if they were interested in obtaining defense contracts or if they were involved in important decisions that would be rendered by Government agencies.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial appearing in the Journal of Lorain, Ohio, on January 29, 1966, entitled "It Pays to Advertise."

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

IT PAYS TO ADVERTISE

The list of American businesses whose success can be attributed in part to a very successful program of advertising is long. On this list are some of the largest and most successful companies in the United States. A new advantage to advertising has been recently revealed, and since it affects a corporation which is considering becoming part of Lorain, the facts are worth noting.

United Artists was an advertiser who placed a full page ad in the 1964 Democratic National Convention program. The cost of this ad was \$15,000. The same corporation also took a full page ad in the Democrats' advertising book "Toward an Age of Greatness" published in December 1965. Again the cost was \$15,000. Both of these ads appeared in