



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1966

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Reverend Father Michael Urbanowich, Marianapolis Preparatory School, Thompson, Conn., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Almighty God, the Lord and Ruler of all nations, today in this glorious House of Representatives of the United States of America we glorify Thee on behalf of the people who, led by Thy providential hand, came to this country from Byelorussia.

We thank Thee for the blessings Thou hast bestowed upon America.

Bless, O Lord, our President, our Speaker, our legislators, our clergy, and the Armed Forces of this land of freedom.

Bless the freedom-loving people of Byelorussia who 48 years ago on March 25, 1918, proclaimed the independence of their Byelorussian Democratic Republic. Freedom and democracy were short-lived in Byelorussia, because the Red army drove them out. Still, the Byelorussian people never lost their hopes for national independence and each year commemorate proclamation of independence—the historic March 25.

As we once more commemorate Byelorussian Independence Day here in these glorious United States, we pray Thee, O loving Father, to give the entire Byelorussian people spiritual strength to resist godless communism and preserve their ideals of liberty. Look down with favor, O Lord, upon Thy children who cry out to Thee in anguish for their deliverance.

We humbly beg Thee to grant that they may soon see the dawn of a better day, when together with all free men they might live in peace and prosperity, worshipping Thee, their only true God and Redeemer, with dignity and honor.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 3, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney;
H.R. 1918. An act for the relief of Eligio Ciardello;
H.R. 2627. An act for the relief of certain classes of civilian employees of naval installations erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to misinterpretation of certain personnel instructions;
H.R. 3076. An act for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased;
H.R. 3236. An act for the relief of Louis Shchuchinski;
H.R. 4928. An act for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki;
H.R. 4995. An act for the relief of Muhammad Sarwar;
H.R. 5231. An act for the relief of Jack Ralph Walker;
H.R. 5530. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert A. Ethridge;
H.R. 5973. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Hower;
H.R. 7667. An act for the relief of Donald F. Farrell; and
H.R. 10338. An act for the relief of Joseph B. Stevens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2752. An act for the relief of Kock Kong Fong;
H.R. 2938. An act for the relief of Przemyslaw Nawakowski;
H.R. 2939. An act for the relief of Manojlo Verzhich;
H.R. 3875. An act for the relief of Mrs. Panagiota Vastakis and Soteris Vastakis;
H.R. 4743. An act for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid;
H.R. 6112. An act for the relief of David

Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Song) and Richard Paul Barker (Pii Su Park);

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Kl Sook Jun; and

H.R. 10403. An act for the relief of Edward F. Murzyn and Edward J. O'Brien.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 146. An act for the relief of Delma S. Pozas;
S. 153. An act for the relief of Matsusuke Tengan;
S. 265. An act to authorize conveyance of certain lands to the State of Utah based upon fair market value;
S. 926. An act for the relief of Laura Hui-Wei Wong and her children, Janet Wong and Simon Wong;
S. 1213. An act for the relief of Richard K. Jones;
S. 1375. An act providing a method for determining the amount of compensation to which certain individuals are entitled as reimbursement for damages sustained by them due to the cancellation of their grazing permits by the U.S. Air Force;
S. 1661. An act for the relief of Samuel C. Neiburg;
S. 1923. An act to amend chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act to give the court supervisory power over all fees paid from whatever source;
S. 1960. An act for the relief of Capt. Rey D. Baldwin;
S. 2153. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated funds for the payment of medical care of temporary and seasonal employees and employees located in isolated areas who become disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work, and for other purposes;
S. 2177. An act for the relief of Donald I. Abbott;
S. 2265. An act for the relief of Konstadyna Byni Dellroglou and her minor child, Alexandros Dellroglou;
S. 2307. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Columbia Basin project, Washington;
S. 2356. An act for the relief of Raymond J. Grachek;
S. 2696. An act for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen;
S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April

March 7, 1966

of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week"; and
S.J. Res. 133, Joint resolution designating February of each year as American History Month.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, because of illness last week I was not present during the vote on S. 1666, which provides for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges. Had I been present, I would have answered "yea" to roll No. 28, which was taken on the passage of this legislation.

I was also not present during the vote on H.R. 12889, the supplemental defense authorization. Had I been present last week, I would have answered "yea" to roll No. 26, which was taken on the passage of this bill.

I would like the Record to show my position on these measures.

FEDERAL LAKES AND RESERVOIRS SHOULD REMAIN FREE TO THE PUBLIC

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to repeal all authority for Federal entrance and admission fees at virtually all Government lakes and reservoirs.

I am convinced the imposition of such fees at reservoirs primarily built for flood control, navigation or power, is neither justified nor necessary.

Furthermore, such fees constitute a breach of contract with the people, whose tax money has been used to acquire the lands and build the dams which make the reservoirs possible.

In many instances, construction of these reservoirs was approved and supported by local people with the definite understanding that no Federal interference of any kind would take place with the time-honored rights to fish and boat on the waters impounded. In the case of our Indian people, many of whom were guaranteed perpetual rights to hunt and fish without interference under treaties many years ago, the new fees are a flagrant violation of traditional, historic rights—and are totally indefensible.

It is one thing to collect a user fee from an individual using a facility like a bathhouse or a special campsite with utilities—both requiring continual maintenance and personnel in attendance. It is entirely a different matter to charge for access to the land and the water which belong to the people in the first place, and have long been used by them for recreational purposes. Especially is this so at reservoirs where recreational facilities are largely incidental to other major reservoir purposes.

These fees, Mr. Speaker, should be prohibited by the Congress, without further delay.

Vietnam

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days, we should all be concerned about the indications that our side is escalating the war in Vietnam. How long can we continue to talk peace on the one hand and raise the level of bombing on the other? They say our bombing in Vietnam is now comparable to any in World War II or in Korea.

Yesterday the paper reported that we were bombing rail lines near China. Also, it said that at least one of our military leaders proposed the mining of Haiphong Harbor. It may not be too long before the Chinese throw their hordes of infantry into Vietnam, as they did into Korea. If we mine the harbor at Haiphong, and interfere with Russian shipping, then we have put their national pride on the line, and they have to react somehow whether they want to or not.

Mr. Speaker, none of us should be afraid to face either China or Russia in a clear situation of our own self-defense. But, I fail to see how a foothold in Vietnam has any value in our own self-defense. How does our fight in that one place assure that insurgency will disappear in every other place on earth?

Until elections are held in Vietnam, we cannot even be sure that we are fighting for what these people want.

Considering all these uncertainties, Mr. Speaker, how can the United States proceed with such assurance and coolness to tempt the gods of world war III?

I must strongly protest the steps of escalation that we are taking. These mean danger to every family in America—and yet they are based on reasons that are not quite good enough.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that illness last week prevented me from voting on the bill H.R. 12889, providing necessary funds for our military operations in Vietnam. If I had been present, I would have voted for the bill without reservation.

THE NEW GI BILL

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the new GI bill signed into law by President Johnson will benefit large numbers of young Americans who have served in the Armed Forces of our country. In my district alone it is estimated that approximately 10,300 veterans are potentially eligible for the benefits and services under the new bill.

This includes education and training programs generally patterned after the highly successful GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict.

The educational provisions of the bill are expected to provide veterans in the 20th District of Ohio almost \$828,000 in direct benefits in the first year. Veterans' Administration guaranteed loans totaling \$2,876,000 to some 190 veterans are also expected in the first year. New

hospital benefits made available to these veterans are expected to total \$42,000 in the first year.

Mr. Speaker, the education and training provisions of this program will help a great deal to prepare more of our young men and women to realize their full potential in life. I know they are welcomed by the veterans in my district.

HALL URGES RETENTION OF SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to insure that the school milk program is extended with adequate appropriations to assure the continued availability of milk at moderate prices in the Nation's schools.

There is growing concern with the administration's actions in refusing to release \$3 million for the special school milk program this year. I cannot agree with the President's proposal to cut funds for the school lunch program by 12 percent and the special milk program by almost 80 percent for the coming fiscal year, while flaunting other areas of domestic fiscal responsibility.

These cutbacks, coming at the same time that "poverty warrior" salaries are being escalated and foreign aid expanded, make no sense to either our dairy farmers or to our schoolchildren and their parents.

These programs have, through the years, proven to be especially effective means of assisting schools in providing nutritionally desirable diets to grade and high school students at moderate prices. They have contributed to the health and development of the Nation's future generation. As a "doctor in the House," I am certainly for these efforts, under local school board control.

During fiscal year 1965, 61.7 million additional half-pints of milk were served to students in the State of Missouri, alone, under these extremely successful programs. Under the administration's proposed program, this would be drastically curtailed. If under the new program, a school district determines that \$3,000 income is the difference between a needy family and a prosperous family, then, the child of a family with \$2,999.99 income will pay nothing for a half-pint of milk. How utterly foolish.

I would much rather see a cut in Mrs. Johnson's so-called beautification program, or in the poverty program, than the \$80 million cut in this vital and important program for our schools, and leaders of tomorrow.

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

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

THE OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE ACT OF 1966

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

March 7, 1966

countries around the world will breathe a high of relief and be glad that it has come out that way.

Mr. BOGGS. Would you mind in that connection talking about—and I know this has military implications—but the different position today in Vietnam today, both military and economic and politically, as compared to just 8 months ago.

Mr. RUSK. Well, I think in the first place, for the past 3 or 4 months the South Vietnamese and allied forces have clearly been on the initiative. If you follow the operational reports as closely as Mr. Boggs does, you will notice that most of the larger operations are on the initiative of the South Vietnamese and allied groups—some 25 to 30 of those separate operations every day. Of course, now, our own newspapermen out there concentrate on the American forces and we lose sight of the fact that about two-thirds of those operations are conducted by the South Vietnamese themselves—and it remains their war. It has not become an American war. We are supporting them. But the initiative is clearly with the South Vietnamese and the allies. The other side has been taking very serious punishment. During 1965, for example, the Vietcong suffered in numbers killed as many as the United States had killed throughout the entire Korean war, and, since the first of this year, those casualty rates have gone up—so they are running into serious trouble not only in the effectiveness of their operations, but also in morale and supply. Now I think another important phase of the battle is the one we discussed in Honolulu in great detail—that is to get on with the economic and social development of the country. That has been given new impetus—the Vietcong still try to disrupt it by attacks on local officials and by disrupting lines of communication and these are tough problems they have there, but the present government, and certainly our Government, are committing themselves fully to it and I would expect increasing rapid change in that field as well.

Mr. BOGGS. Now Mr. Secretary, we just have time for one or two other questions. The suggestion has been made by some that we, in our efforts to go to the bargaining table and negotiating table with a peaceful conference that we include the Vietcong. Would you mind disposing of that contention?

Mr. RUSK. Well, in the first place the other side has made it quite clear that their condition is that the Vietcong be accepted as the sole representatives of the South Vietnamese people. They haven't been qualifying this demand. Secondly, the Vietcong is an arm of Hanoi. Their views can be ascertained, but we shan't impose upon the people of South Vietnam this outfit, which has not been chosen by the people of South Vietnam and which represents somebody else.

Mr. BOGGS. It's a front, pure and simple.

Mr. RUSK. Now, if the South Vietnamese have some peace and can have their elections, they can choose whatever government they want. I'm convinced myself that the South Vietnamese people are not going to choose a liberation front or the representatives of Hanoi—a million people, you remember, hauled left Hanoi after the division of Vietnam in order to escape this Communist regime.

Mr. BOGGS. Right, Mr. Secretary, do you feel we are making progress in an orderly fashion—would you venture a prediction on how long military operations may have to continue? I know that this is a difficult thing.

Mr. RUSK. No; it's hard to predict. There is a long, hard job ahead, even if the main military operations were to be brought to a conclusion, you'd still have a considerable guerrilla problem and sabotage in the country for the South Vietnamese to dispose of, but in these crises we have had since 1945, the end comes rather quickly and unexpectedly. I am thinking now about the Greek guerrillas

and about the Berlin blockade, even the Korean war—so it is a little hard to know just when it will come. I think it will come when Hanoi fully realizes they are not going to have South Vietnam by force, and then we will see a break in the situation.

Mr. BOGGS. One final question—Do you think the vote in Congress this week was helpful?

Mr. RUSK. It was indeed and I think that very strong vote in support of what is going on in South Vietnam will be helpful not only in the housekeeping aspect of it but as a demonstration of determination to the South Vietnamese and indeed to Hanoi, and I must say I was deeply grateful for the overwhelming vote that you gentlemen down here gave us on that bill.

Mr. BOGGS. Well, Mr. Secretary, I know we could go on for a much longer period, but our time has expired. Thank you very much for joining with us this morning in this report to our people in south Louisiana.

Mr. RUSK. It is a great pleasure to be here, Mr. Boggs. Thank you, sir.

THE U.S. LEGAL RIGHT TO BE IN VIETNAM—THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S HOUSE OF DELEGATES SPEAKS

(Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker there has been debate in the our country about the U.S. legal right to be in Vietnam.

The American Bar Association's House of Delegates spoke loud and clear on this issue at its midwinter meeting in Chicago February 21, 1966.

That body unanimously adopted a resolution and report supporting the position of the United States. The resolution should put to rest any doubts about our position.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that the resolution was the work of one of my constituents, Eberhard P. Deutsch, chairman of the Standing Committee on Peace and Law through United Nations.

Mr. Deutsch is a world renowned attorney who has given of himself for the past 41 years in perfecting the American system of justice, both in the practice of civil and military law.

All Americans owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Deutsch. May we all continue to deserve his efforts.

Following is the resolution and report adopted by the American Bar Association in addition to a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Deutsch:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION SPECIAL JOINT REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PEACE AND LAW THROUGH UNITED NATIONS AND THE SECTION OF INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW

RECOMMENDATION

Whereas in recent hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, it has been stated that international lawyers are agreed that the U.S. position in Vietnam is illegal and in violation of the charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas articles 51 and 52 of the charter sanction steps for self-defense and collective and regional security arrangements such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization to which the United States is a party; and

Whereas in the course of these hearings, it has been suggested that an expression on

this subject by the American Bar Association would be appropriate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Bar Association, That the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution immediately to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate.

REPORT

The attention of the committee and the council has been called to the recent widely publicized hearings on appropriations for support of the U.S. forces in Vietnam before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate.

At these hearings, it has been suggested that international lawyers are agreed that the U.S. position in Vietnam is illegal and in violation of the United Nations Charter.

Articles 51 and 52 of the charter expressly provide that nothing contained therein "shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense," nor preclude "the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action." The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is such an arrangement or agency.

Professors of international law of some 31 law schools have expressed their opinion, and it is the opinion of the members of this association's Standing Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations and of the members of the Council of the Section of International and Comparative Law, that the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal, and is not in violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

During the course of the Senate committee hearings, it was suggested that it would be desirable to have an expression on this subject by the American Bar Association.

The matter was taken up at a joint session of the committee and the council of the section which now jointly recommend adoption by the house of delegates of the resolution herein above set forth to the effect that it is the position of the American Bar Association that the presence of U.S. forces in Vietnam is legal under international law, and in accord with the charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty.

EBERHARD P. DEUTSCH,
*Chairman, Standing Committee on
Peace and Law Through United
Nations.*

EDWARD D. RE,
*Chairman, Section of International
and Comparative Law.*

Recommendation adopted unanimously on February 21, 1966, by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association at its midwinter meeting in Chicago, Ill.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF Mr. EBERHARD DEUTSCH

Eberhard P. Deutsch was born on October 31, 1897, in Cincinnati, Ohio, where he completed his early studies. His parents were Dr. and Mrs. Gotthard (Hermine Bacher) Deutsch of that city.

In April 1917, he enlisted in the 1st Illinois Cavalry—later the 122d U.S. Field Artillery—in which, with the 33d Division, U.S. Army, he served throughout the First World War, rising to rank of lieutenant.

In 1925, he completed his studies as a special student at the College of Law of Tulane University, and has been engaged in the general practice of civil law ever since at New Orleans, where he is senior member of the law firm of Deutsch, Kerrigan & Stiles.

In 1942, he again entered military service, reaching the rank of colonel, and serving with various combat and military-government units throughout, and following close of the Second World War.

Colonel Deutsch completed his tour of active military duty in the fall of 1946, having served since close of hostilities in Europe, as principal legal adviser to Gen. Mark W. Clark, and as Chief of the Allied Legal Directorate, in the military administration of Austria, and in the re-creation of that country as a free and independent nation.

During his service in Austria, Colonel Deutsch devised, and assisted in putting into effect, the so-called negative veto, under which decrees promulgated by the Austrian Government, and legislation enacted by the Parliament of Austria, became effective throughout the country in 31 days unless unambiguously rejected by the quadri-partite (United States, British, French, and Soviet) Allied Military Commission in the meantime.

Colonel Deutsch took part in 12 major engagements, including the invasion of Sicily and in airborne landing behind the lines in Normandy. He has a total of some 16 American and French decorations and service medals.

Colonel Deutsch is Honorary Consul of the Republic of Austria at New Orleans, and civilian aid for the State of Louisiana, to the Secretary of the Army.

In 1936, Mr. Deutsch was counsel for publishers in their successful attack on a Louisiana advertising tax, declared unanimously by the Supreme Court of the United States to constitute an infringement of the constitutional guaranty of a free press.

In 1950-52, Mr. Deutsch, as Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, successfully prepared and prosecuted the appeal of the United States from adverse judgments in the vast Texas City disaster litigation, believed to be the largest civil action of its kind in the history of the world.

He has been (1961-62) chairman of the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on Admiralty and Maritime Law, and for many years a member, and chairman (1962-63 and 1965 to date) of that association's Standing Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations. He is, and has been for several years, chairman of the Louisiana State Bar Association's Standing Committee on Law Reform, and regularly takes a leading part in many civic activities.

Mr. Deutsch is the author of a plan for reconstitution of the International Court of Justice, to give it uniform, universal, compulsory jurisdiction over all nations, without undue surrender of their sovereignty. The plan is described in Mr. Deutsch's leading article in the American Bar Association Journal for June 1963, and was approved unanimously in August 1965, by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association.

Mr. Deutsch has been a frequent contributor to American Bar Association Journal, and is the author of many leading articles which have appeared in various legal publications during the past 30 years, on constitutional, maritime, and international law.

(Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. CONYERS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

(GLUE SNIFFING)

(Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years the subject of glue sniffing has occupied the time and energy of many local governments and has been studied at the National level. Many municipalities and States have enacted statutes aimed at either promiscuous uses of these solvents or at restricting the sale of products containing toxic solvents, as in the case of the New York City ordinance. However, no concrete action on a National scale has been started to discourage and prevent glue sniffing.

The problem is not abating but rather is increasing. Reports continue to pour in from my district telling of teenagers drunk, dizzy, and euphoric from inhaling fumes of plastic cements and other organic solvents. Similar events have been reported in Memphis, Boston, Hawaii, and other areas throughout the Nation.

It is clear from existing research that this form of aberrant behavior among our teen and preteenagers causes a syndrome resembling acute alcoholic intoxication. Apart from the incalculable harm done while children are under its influence, inhaling the solvents from glues and other substances produces physical injury. It is apparent from the many articles and clinical evidence that a young body can be seriously damaged from inhalation of certain solvents. I do not believe we need wait any longer for additional evidence and more substantiating cases attesting to damage of the human body. It is time to initiate a program to deter and prevent the practice. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to introduce legislation amending the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to require manufacturers of glues and other substances containing toxic solvents to label their product with a skull and crossbones and the word "poison." In addition, the tube or bottle containing the product should bear a label warning that the vapor may be harmful and that the product should be used only in a well-ventilated area.

The legislation will apply to glues and other substances containing the organic solvents most frequently producing the intoxicating effect, such as toluene, xylene, methyl isobutylketone, methyl cellasolve acetate, isopropyl alcohol, methylethyl ketone, acetone, ethyl acetate, or their combinations.

In addition, it will also require that products containing these organic solvents be removed from the open shelves of stores.

Mr. Speaker, I do not delude myself that this legislation will reform existing sniffers, but it may deter any new converts to this dangerous practice. We must direct efforts aimed at correcting the underlying emotional disorders to make any real headway with the hard core toxic solvent sniffer. These young people are potential drug addicts of tomorrow. Let us take steps to nip many of these, at an early stage, when the job of rehabilitation is not so difficult a task.

I might add that I believe the Congress should push vigorously ahead with pending legislation covering civil commitment for drug addicts and a Federal aid program for drug treatment centers. We must realize the seriousness of the problem and take creative steps to aid

those human creatures lost in a world of opiate dreams to find a place in the real world.

A FATHER AND HIS SON SPEAK ABOUT VIETNAM

(Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about Vietnam, no one is more deserving of being heard than the young men who are there fighting for us all and the families of those men here awaiting their return.

A few days ago, I received a letter from the father of one of those young men, one who though wounded is still there in Vietnam engaged against the enemy. Nothing that I can say can add to the courage and determination manifested by the words of this father and his son.

I am sure that all my colleagues, all Americans will share my heartfelt gratitude to these two great men and the pride that they are of us. And, above all, like our President and all Americans, I pray that a just and honorable way may soon be found to end this conflict, so that Jack and all his comrades may be home again with their families.

The text of the letter follows:

GLEN RIDGE, N.J.,
February 24, 1966.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
Commerce Court Building,
10 Commerce Court,
Newark, N.J.

DEAR PETER: That was very nice of you, PETE, to drop me a little note commenting on our son Jack being wounded in Vietnam. This is typical of the thoughtfulness and consideration you have for your constituents, regardless of their party affiliation, which has endeared you to so many thousands of people in the district.

As a Member of Congress you may seem to be called upon to express an opinion either in support of or opposed to the administration's policy in Vietnam. You may therefore be interested in this excerpt from a letter we recently received from Jack:

"I was very lucky previously and there is a chance I won't be so lucky next time. If anything should happen I don't want any big moping going on. I chose to be here and I am proud to do my job."

As President Johnson said last night on the television, the boys who are doing a job like our son Jack have no doubts at all whether they are doing the right thing for our country and our freedom. From your letter, as well as the fact that you have been over there personally, I know that you understand this too. Thus, I know you won't be sidetracked by the strange views of some of your colleagues in the Senate whose motives are so hard to understand.

Thank you again for your letter. I hope you will take every opportunity to become as vocal as possible in supporting our mission in Vietnam.

With kindest regards,

W. JEFFERSON LYON.

H.R. 13319, EXTENSION OF THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Companies that will help feed the world—Continued

Company	Operating data				Stock data			
	Assets (millions)	1965 revenues (millions)	1965 net income (millions)	Latest 12 months earnings per share	Recent price	5-year price range	1966 indicated dividend	Yield (percent)
CONSTRUCTION								
Foster Wheeler.....	\$96	\$228	\$1.9	\$2.65	48 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	51 $\frac{1}{2}$ —22 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	\$1.40	2.9
Kaiser Industries.....	441	7462	15.1	73	18 $\frac{3}{4}$ %	15—51 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	(²)	5.4
Morrison-Knudsen.....	135	314	5.3	2.57	29 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	35 $\frac{1}{2}$ —26 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	1.60	3.6
Pullman.....	300	661	20.6	4.51	66 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	73 $\frac{1}{2}$ —20 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	2.40	
GRAIN-CARRYING RAILROADS								
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.....	1,857	677	91.0	3.45	41 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	42—20 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	1.60	3.9
Chicago, Milwaukee.....	682	241	7.3	2.16	61 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	64—7	1.00	1.6
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific.....	497	211	1.5	1.5	42 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	47—14 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	(³)	
Illinois Central Industries.....	743	283	9.8	6.66	78 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	81—31 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	2.40	3.1
Missouri Pacific.....	1,106	417	26.3	14.26	94 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	96 $\frac{1}{2}$ —35 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	5.00	5.3
Union Pacific.....	1,765	549	93.8	4.03	47 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	49 $\frac{1}{2}$ —27 $\frac{1}{2}$ %	1.80	3.8

¹ 12 months ended Sept. 30.
² Excludes excise taxes.
³ None.
⁴ Stock data for Unilever N.V. shares.

⁵ Estimates.
⁶ Plus stock.
⁷ 12 months ended June 30.
⁸ Deficit.

TWICE AS MANY SUKARNOS?

Each generation faces its own crisis. In the thirties and forties it was the rise of fascism. In the fifties and sixties it has been communism. In the seventies and eighties it's likely to be an even more virulent threat: Hunger. Americans probably won't go hungry, but most of the rest of the world will, and we won't be able to escape the consequences.

On pages 19 through 26 of this issue, the editors of Forbes examine the economic implications of population growth pressing against an inflexible food supply. The work of a six-man Forbes team, the report takes a generally optimistic view about what U.S. business can do about the situation—and how it can benefit from it.

But not everybody is optimistic, and we think it only fair to expose our readers to the views of an extremely well-informed businessman who thinks the prospects for feeding the world over the next few decades are dim.

He's Thomas M. Ware, 47-year-old chairman of International Minerals & Chemical. Under Tom Ware's brilliant direction IMC has been extremely aggressive in expanding in the fertilizer field. But that isn't Tom Ware's only credential. He is chairman of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation, a nonprofit organization that promotes support among businessmen for the food programs of the United Nations. Most important of all, Tom Ware is an engaged and aroused citizen.

"Hope always springs eternal," he told Forbes late last month. "But I don't see how on earth it's possible for the world to feed itself in the years ahead."

UNDERUSED TOOLS

It isn't a shortage of fertilizer, he emphasizes, of implements, of seeds, or even of land. The trouble is even more basic: It lies in the human mind. "Intelligence," he says, "is capital. We've spent billions on education in this country to get the amount of intelligence we have today. The underdeveloped countries haven't, and they aren't going to be able to catch up overnight."

"We've got the tools," he goes on. "TV is a great tool for mass education. Computers and jet planes give seven-league boots to brilliant men. Satellite communications can spread ideas instantaneously."

"But, because of a lack of education, of intelligence, many of our tools are not being used properly. Atomic power cannot be used for digging irrigation projects because of politics. Population control cannot always be used effectively because of religious ethic. And remember that the sword we give some-

one to cut food can also be used to slay somebody else."

Ware believes that hunger itself breeds ignorance. "If half the people in the world are starving," he says, "then half the world's minds are permanently maimed. They just don't have the voltage between the ears to get any work done. How can a mental dwarf who has no energy grow more food?"

TO THE SKY?

In his own field of fertilizer, Ware says, proper use takes intelligence and education. "Every soil is different, and needs different treatment," he says. "An American farmer knows just what he needs, and has the capital to pay for it. But a man who can't read might put fertilizer on a plant a foot thick and expect it to grow to the sky. Instead the plant would grow at all."

Ware is concerned too that Americans aren't sufficiently aroused and may wait too long to take really effective action. He points out that it took 15 years to open up his company's big new potash mine in Saskatchewan. "For the first 5 years, we had to sit and assay the market. The next 5 were taken up with design and planning. The third 5 were spent actually digging the hole. In addition to all that time, there was the \$60 million we spent. That experience has made me very respectful of the meaning of a doubled population in just 35 years."

SCORCHED EARTH

Finally, he speaks about the scarcity of arable soil in the world, and of the fact that world hunger will create turmoil that destroys soil. "The soil was destroyed by war in the Nile Valley and the Mediterranean Basin, and now it's being scorched in Vietnam," he says. "When you double the population, you're going to double the number of Sukarnos, Cubas, Vietnams, library burnings, and the like. More accurately, you're probably going to get eight times as much trouble."

We hope Tom Ware is wrong in his pessimistic view. In fact, he hopes so, too. But unless the American people and American business make a mighty effort, and soon * * * well, Ware knows what he is talking about, if any man does.

CAREFUL ASSESSMENT OF DOMESTIC PROGRAM EXPENDITURES URGED

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, for sometime I have been convinced that we must assess very carefully and wisely the expenditures for our domestic pro-

grams in light of the needs to win the war in Vietnam.

If we are to have a "win" policy in Vietnam, we must look at the domestic programs to determine where cuts should be made. These cuts rightly should be channeled into our military effort so that we may be able to win the war at the earliest opportunity.

I believe the editor of the Farm Journal in the March 1966 issue made a very valid point when he asked:

Isn't it about time we all got into this war, all made some sacrifice? Should we just leave all the sacrificing to 200,000 or more American boys in Vietnam?

The editor is convinced that we cannot continue full speed ahead on both the domestic and Vietnam areas without a necessary trimming back on the domestic front.

This editorial should be required reading for those who believe we can do both.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "It's Our War," be placed in the RECORD.

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

It's OUR WAR

Isn't it about time we all got into this war, all made some sacrifice? Should we just leave all the sacrificing to 200,000 or more Americans boys in Vietnam?

We may as well admit it: For the most of us except those boys and their families back home, life has been going on pretty cozily. We've followed the news of the war, but then have gone on about our affairs undisturbed. Most Americans have been doing pretty well financially. They've enjoyed all the usual pleasures and some extra ones, kept comfortable and snug.

Partly this was because we hoped that this war which we drifted into would soon end, and that the Vietnam nightmare would somehow go away. But we see now that likely we are in for a long and dirty fight and that the cost in men and money will probably go up, not down.

What can we noncombatants do? Well, for one thing, we can realize we are in a war and act like it. We can ask our Government to do the same.

In his annual budget message the President called on us to "support the struggle in Vietnam" but then added that "the struggle for a Great Society must go on unabated." Unabated, with a war going on?

We doubt that he really meant it, for already some spending programs have been cut back. But they need to be trimmed a lot more and the effort turned to the military struggle and the prevention of more inflation. Those are the two big jobs on our hands now. That's plenty; other things can surely wait.

We can make the draft more fair. It can never be fully fair, but so far it has been falling too heavily on the boys not shielded by the sanctuary of college.

If we need more taxes to curtail Government deficits let's have them, unpleasant though taxes are. But not unless or until we've cut out spending for things we can forgo or at least postpone. Let's try that first.

In today's world we need allies. World opinion is a powerful force. But how many American boys should we sacrifice for fear of offending "allies" who are sending food and material to a shooting enemy?

It seemed to us that the bombing lull, the dispatch of our emissaries to all parts of the world, the appeal to the United Nations, futile as that organization is, were all worth trying. We favor making every other possible attempt at peace. The President has tried hard.

What we are asking now is that he first consult fully with Congress, which he hasn't done, then have the courage to tell us what is necessary and when. In brief, let's all of us begin to share this war, so far as possible, with the boys doing the fighting. It will be mightily uneven sharing at best, but at least we can start acting like this is our war, not just their.

OUR NATION'S CAPITAL COLORING BOOK

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in dignified impressive ceremonies at Valley Forge, Pa., on February 22, 1966, the U.S. Capitol Historical Society was presented with its second Freedoms Foundation award. Honored with a 1964 citation for we, the people, the society was recognized again for its 1965 publication, *Our Nation's Capital Coloring Book*.

The principal Americana Award was presented to the U.S. Capitol Historical Society of Washington, D.C.

Honoring our Nation's Capital Coloring Book, using the historic and scenic monuments of the Capital City, re-created our heritage in story and picture and included a recommended reading list, a full color page of State flags, a tour map of the city and note pages.

Representing the society at Valley Forge was the driving force founder, and first president of the society Fred Schwengel of Davenport former Congressman from the First District of Iowa.

In presenting the George Washington Honor Medal, Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, made the following remarks:

This next award goes to show what can be done with an idea in this great free society of ours. The staff of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, ever mindful of the importance of history to the impressionable young, decided that in order to meet the minds of our youth it must bend to the child's own media. The result was a combination history-coloring book that is now being used in classrooms all over America. It is one thing to produce a coloring book, but another to rank among the top echelon of Freedoms Foundation awards. Our jury felt that this was a great thing being done for millions of young Amer-

icans and we are proud to present this medal to the society. Our most sincere congratulations.

Mr. President, I am sure this is an honor with which all Members of Congress and millions of other people are in full agreement. All of us know of the outstanding job that the United States Capitol Historical Society has been doing to make our people more acquainted with the facts and traditions of the U.S. Capitol.

I believe that the untiring work of Mr. Schwengel should share in this recognition because I know how long and how hard he has labored so that the United States Capitol Historical Society will fulfill the dreams of its founders.

VIETNAM: CONTAINMENT OR ACCOMMODATION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Washington Sunday Star, in its lengthy and well-put lead editorial yesterday, examined the crux of the current debate over America's Vietnam policy, cut through the entangling maze of questions and answers and reached a conclusion. That conclusion was that, "Given the importance that Vietnam has assumed as a test case for Mao's doctrines of revolutionary conquest, there is, at present no realistic alternative to military containment" of Red China.

The Star's editorial commands attention, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 6, 1966]

CRUCIAL ISSUE: CONTAINMENT OR ACCOMMODATION

The continuing debate on Vietnam has not produced a solution to our problem in that part of the world. But it has succeeded to an encouraging degree in getting the problem down to its essentials.

More and more, in recent days, the debate has begun to transcend the ambiguities of Vietnam itself and center on the problem of the containment of Communist China. More and more, both those who defend our policies in Vietnam and those who criticize them have cast their arguments in terms of a confrontation between American power and that of the vast nation which has taken over as the primary global antagonist of the United States.

Most serious critics of the administration now admit that the containment of China, in southeast Asia and elsewhere, is a vital interest of the United States. The question is simply whether or not the war in Vietnam serves this purpose. Are we containing or provoking China in Vietnam? Are we decreasing or increasing the risk of all-out conflict? Have we the means of attaining our objectives? Is there, in fact, a practical alternative to the military containment of Chinese expansionism in Vietnam and elsewhere?

The answers to all of these questions depend finally on an assessment of the capacities and ambitions of the regime in Peiping. If, as the critics fear, the capacities of Red China are virtually unlimited, military containment is indeed a dubious proposition. And if, as they hope, its ambitions are modest, an alternative might be found.

The alternative suggested, most explicitly by Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Senate For-

eign Relations Committee, is what he calls an "accommodation" with China on a large scale. Peiping, he believes, can be induced to settle for the neutralization of southeast Asia in return for the withdrawal of American power from the area. If this were done, he implies, the aggressive nature of the Communist regime would change and stability would return along China's borders.

In our view the main trouble with this analysis is the fact that it is refuted by virtually every scrap of available evidence about the capacities and ambitions of the regime in Peiping—which, incidentally, greeted Senator FULBRIGHT's suggestion with the revelation that he and his fellow doves are as big "fools" in Peiping's book as are the American hawks. It is also in contradiction with the major conclusion based on this evidence: That today the ambitions of the leaders in Peiping far exceed their material capabilities and that the military containment of China has been an established fact for 15 years.

Those who would seek to assuage China's aggressive expansionism by any sort of a deal in southeast Asia must first close their eyes firmly to the dimensions of Peiping's territorial appetite. The neutralization, or even the outright surrender of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia would amount to a drop in the bucket to a regime which loudly asserts traditional claims to hundreds of thousands of square miles on its periphery.

The presence of American power in Vietnam is a minor irritant compared to the presence of American power in South Korea or Nationalist Chinese power on Taiwan. Appeasement in any form is hardly a realistic solution for a country whose list of unfulfilled demands also includes large parts of Siberia, India, Nepal, Bhutan, Burma, Thailand, and Malaysia.

These territorial claims, combined with the militant spirit of the regime in Peiping, have in fact forced a policy of military containment on most of China's neighbors since the consolidation of communism on the mainland in 1949.

The Chinese have contested this containment many times in many places, sometimes with success. Tibet has been invaded and occupied. Direct aggression has been fostered against South Korea. Many clashes have occurred along the Chinese-Russian border. Probing attacks have been made on India. The Nationalist Chinese islands of Quemoy and Matsu in the Formosa Straits have come under bombardment and the threat of invasion from the mainland.

Yet, with the exception of Tibet which had no means of military defense and India where the Chinese still occupy some contested border territory, the lines of containment have held. Today, the encirclement of China about which the leaders in Peiping constantly complain is very real indeed. And the pressure of American power from northern Japan to Thailand on which a major sector of the ring of containment depends has grown to formidable proportions.

Since Korea, the leadership in Peiping has carefully avoided the risk of a direct confrontation with this American power. For all the bluster about paper tigers they have backed away from every situation which threatened to involve American airpower against Chinese territory. Confident as they may be of their ability to defeat any actual invasion of the mainland, the leaders in Peiping are thoroughly aware of China's vulnerability, even in terms of nonnuclear weapons that could be brought to bear.

The formula of conquest by proxy, developed from Mao Tse-tung's doctrines of "peoples' wars of national liberation," has in recent years provided an ingenious solution to the dilemma which has confronted China. Without risk of direct involvement,

March 7, 1966

the encouragement and support of indigenous rebellions in areas marked for conquest have promised to provide the key to unlock the wall of containment and satisfy at least some of Peiping's territorial ambitions.

Vietnam offered the ideal terrain. Since the French occupation, all the apparatus for successful subversive warfare had been at hand. A successful "war of national liberation" in Vietnam—particularly one which ended in the withdrawal of American power from southeast Asia—would open up innumerable opportunities for the expansion of Chinese domination in southeast Asia. Above all, perhaps, in the struggle with Russia for domination of the world Communist movement, success in Vietnam would provide the vindication of the Peiping's militant doctrines.

On the other hand, if Chinese ambitions should fall in Vietnam the outlook from Peiping's point of view would be a good deal less encouraging. If the result of the war there turned out to be a massive new injection of American power, the containment of the rebellion and the strengthening of resistance to subversion in other less vulnerable areas, the leaders in Peiping might be induced to modify some of their most cherished hopes.

Indeed, there is good reason to believe that this result is well on its way to being achieved. In Laos and Thailand, the American buildup in Vietnam has brought about a remarkable stiffening of resistance to Communist pressures. In Indonesia, the hope of the Communists of turning the American position by seizing power has ended in stunning disaster. In Ghana and Cuba, Mao's theories of the exportability of world revolution have suffered serious reverses.

The fact which emerges, and which should impress itself on American doubters, is that the very survival of neutralism today in Asia—in Burma, Cambodia, and Indonesia, for instance—depends very much on the success of the containment effort in Vietnam. The leaders in Peiping have been impressed enough by the difficulties which they are encountering everywhere to warn their people that they must expect temporary reverses and retreats along the road to ultimate victory.

Given the importance that Vietnam has assumed as a test case for Mao's doctrines of revolutionary conquest, there is, at present, no realistic alternative to military containment. The time to begin talking about accommodations will come when the door to aggressive Chinese expansion has been firmly closed once and for all. Under these conditions, a genuine accommodation would take the form of opening the door to China's entry into the community of responsible nations. And this is the ultimate objective to which American policy in Asia should be unswervingly directed.

COOPERATIVE WEATHER OBSERVERS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, for more than a hundred years in this country devoted public servants have been daily performing a public service of which most Americans are not aware. These men are the cooperative weather observers of the U.S. Department of Commerce Weather Bureau.

Under this program, the observer is furnished the necessary instruments and without compensation he takes and records daily observations of the weather. Today in the United States there are over 12,000 of these observers, and it is estimated that these volunteers give to the Government about 1 million hours yearly.

Mr. President, recently the Commerce Department published a book saluting the fine record of those who have been making weather observations for 30 or more years. In my own State of California, there are more than 900 cooperative weather stations in operation and 13 of the men who man these stations have given over 30 years of service to the Weather Bureau.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the information from "The Cooperative Weather Observer," saluting the efforts of the California volunteers, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CALIFORNIA

A natural resource of first importance to California is the diversity of its climates. Found within her boundaries are the dry desert climate of the southeast and the humid region of the northern coastal mountains. Temperatures range from the searing heat of the desert and the interior valleys to the usually cool pattern of the north coast and the cold winter of the high Sierra Nevadas. It is the cooperative observer who has documented these several climates through the years so that we can tell what they are. The records have many applications.

Consider, for example, the western portion of the San Joaquin Valley. This is an area with a desert-like climate. Few people live here, but for 50 years the operator of an oil company pumping plant maintained a cooperative weather record. Today plans are being made to bring in irrigation water, and the long and complete record from Middlewater forms a basis for estimating the climate of the rest of that area so that growers will be able to make effective use of the newly opened agricultural area.

From time to time flooding has occurred in one part of the State or another, and the records of the cooperative observers are of vital significance in an analysis of these floods. Not only is it important to know what rain fell during the flood situation, but long records of more normal conditions are necessary if users are to evaluate properly the significance of the periods of high rainfall. Damage suits in some flood damage cases amount to several millions of dollars.

Of interest in delineating the climate of an area are the infrequent extremes that suggest the outside limits of weather that can be expected. Typical is the high temperature of 134 degrees F. observed at Greenland Ranch on July 10, 1913. Snowfall amounting to 60 inches was reported in a 24-hour period on January 18 and 19, 1933, at Giant Forest. The total for a season was 884 inches at Tamarack in 1906-07. Some of the heaviest precipitation rates are 1.03 inches in 1 minute at Opids Camp on April 5, 1926, 11.50 inches in 80 minutes at Campo on August 12, 1891, and 26.12 inches in 24 hours at Hoeegees on January 22, 1943.

Without the help of the cooperative observers who make their readings regularly each day we would have no information on which to base an estimate of these extremes.

HOWARD E. ALLARD, WILLOWS

Mr. Allard has been the official observer in Willows since 1926, continuing a record started in 1878. For 36 years he was with the irrigation district until his retirement in 1958, and since that time he has served as a city official in Willows. He has taken an active position of leadership in the community, in his church, and in the several branches of the Masonic lodge. At Willows, as at many stations, the weather observations have been a family project.

ERNEST J. ANDERSON, ORLEANS

Mr. Anderson became the observer at Orleans in 1882, continuing a record that started in 1855. For his outstanding work he was given the John Campanius Holm award in 1964.

ROBERT E. BURTON, SANTA CRUZ

Mr. Burton has operated this station since 1931, except for the war years when he was on duty in the Pacific with the U.S. Navy. During that time he served on Ponape and operated a weather station there. His wife, son, and a neighbor operated the Santa Cruz weather station during that period.

As a special project Mr. Burton has devised equipment for estimating the amount of dew deposited on redwood trees and has found as much as 40 to 60 gallons of water per acre on some nights. He received the John Campanius Holm award in 1964.

At the present time Mr. Burton is a county supervisor for Santa Cruz County.

CARLOS A. CALL, FORT ROSS

In 1907 Mr. Call succeeded his father, who had been observing precipitation at Fort Ross since 1874. A storm in November of 1874 gave a measured total of 18.06 inches of precipitation in 24 hours, and probably the amount was more than 20 inches. The gage ran over at one time during the storm. Mr. Call has sent us copies of data extracted from the records of the Russian colony that manned Fort Ross as early as 1840.

The 91-year record within the family and the 58-year record by Carlos Call are outstanding not only for their length but also for their quality. Mr. Call was chosen in 1960 to receive the John Campanius Holm award and in 1965 the Jefferson award for outstanding service as a cooperative observer.

WALTER CANTRALL, JESS VALLEY

Mr. Cantrall was born in Jess Valley and he continued to live there to the present time. He has been the sole observer at this station since its establishment in 1929, and the record is not worthy for the total lack of missing data.

Shortly after this station was established Mr. Cantrall assisted water resource officials in the selection, measurement, and marking of a new snow course that is still in use more than 30 years later.

EDWARD C. GERLACH, LONE TREE CANYON

Mr. Gerlach has been the observer ever since this station was established in 1933. It is in an area of precious little rainfall, where an accurate measurement of what little does fall is of vital importance. He is interested in community activities and has donated land to the Rod and Gun Club for their rifle range.

LEROY KEMP, SQUIRREL INN NO. 2

Mr. Kemp was first appointed as the official observer in 1929, although he had in fact been taking observations for several years prior to this, both at Squirrel Inn No. 1 and No. 2. He visited the San Bernardino Mountains for a summer vacation in 1924 and has remained there for 40 years. During that time he has worked for the Squirrel Inn, the school district, and the fire protection district, among others, retiring in 1960. For many years he has sent in special weekly snow reports during the winter for the National Weekly Weather and Crop Bulletin.

ARCHIE C. LEACH, CAMPO

Mr. Leach is a rancher who was formerly with the engineering department of the city of San Francisco. His engineering background and his present interests lead to close attention to the accuracy of his precipitation records. He has operated the Campo weather station since January 1926.

This station experienced a cloudburst on August 12, 1891, that produced 11.50 inches of precipitation in 80 minutes. The intensity of the storm is documented by newspaper accounts of the damage done.

DOWEN L. PAULSON, ST. HELENA

Mr. Paulson was born in St. Helena, and except for brief periods of work in other communities he has lived there to the present time. He became a printer in 1902 and worked at that trade until he retired in 1955. He has been the weather observer at St. Helena since 1921, continuing a record started in 1907. His station was one that was chosen to test the dial thermometer a few years ago, and Mr. Paulson received the John Campanius Holm Award in 1961. He lives on his own ranch with his two brothers.

ROGER C. RICE, LOS BANOS

Mr. Rice is a licensed civil engineer, employed as watermaster and chief hydrographer for the network of irrigation canals serving much of central California. Prior to his present employment he was with the U.S. Geological Survey and with Southern California Edison Co., serving at various times in Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Honolulu, Kansas, and Arizona. He has published a number of articles in his field, including one that appeared in the Monthly Weather Review.

Mr. Rice has been the official observer at Los Banos since 1931 and has done an outstanding job of summarizing weather records that go back to 1873. In 1962 he was awarded the John Campanius Holm Award for outstanding service.

WILLIAM B. TEMPLE, COVINA TEMPLE FC 193

Mr. Temple, a leader in civic affairs in the Covina area, is continuing a precipitation record started by his father in 1902 and assumed by him in 1930. In recent years the citrus orchard that surrounded his home has given way to a subdivision that has built up in the area.

BARWIN M. TING, ESCONDIDO

Mr. Ting has been the observer at this station since February 1935, when he replaced Mr. Moon, who had served for 41 years. Mr. Ting is a pharmacist and owns and operates his own drugstore.

K. R. WARREN, WHITTIER CITY HALL

Mr. Warren is an official of the Whittier Water Co. and reports rainfall information to the Los Angeles County Flood Control District as well as to the Weather Bureau.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE POLICY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland, recently spoke before the Maritime Administrative Bar Association on the subject of American merchant marine policy.

During his 18 years in Congress, Representative GARMATZ has acquired an expert knowledge of the problems facing our merchant marine. He is eminently qualified to speak on maritime matters.

Representative GARMATZ, in his speech, calls for an end of the proliferation of studies of merchant marine problems and a beginning of effective remedial action. He points especially to the construction of nuclear propelled merchant vessels as a stimulus to reverse the decline of the merchant marine.

I am in complete agreement with Representative GARMATZ' plea to end the inertia prevailing in our maritime program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Representative GARMATZ to the Maritime Administrative Bar Association on February 10, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, BEFORE THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATIVE BAR ASSOCIATION, LAWYERS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 10, 1966

We have all been reading and hearing that the immediate months ahead are critical ones for the American merchant marine and shipbuilding industry. Perhaps they will be, but I suspect that the important matters for administrative, executive, and legislative decision, will be of a different nature than many people are thinking.

I do not expect that we will be actively concerned during this session of Congress with any drastic or revolutionary overhaul of our national, maritime policy or programs.

Whatever else might be said about the American merchant marine, it has hardly been the subject of insufficient study.

Since I was first elected to Congress 18 years ago, there has scarcely been a year when some governmental committee or quasi-governmental committee, was not analyzing or dissecting the American merchant marine.

During those years, we have witnessed at least 25 major studies of varying descriptions by the executive and legislative branches of our Government—not to mention countless minor studies.

In more recent years, we have had the project Walrus report of the National Academy of science, the report of the Maritime Evaluation Committee of the Department of Commerce, the Interagency Maritime Task Force Report, and the report of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee.

I am ready to make one prediction—that we are reaching inevitably the end of an era—the time is approaching when there must be a halt to this proliferation of studies.

Either we will find a way to follow through with the effective execution of our maritime policy and programs, as enacted by Congress, or there will no longer be a subject available for study. I am confident that the way for promoting and sustaining a healthy American merchant marine and shipbuilding industry, will be found.

In my opinion, the difficulties which now beset our maritime industry are largely attributable to the ineffective, and half-hearted administration of the statutory programs, rather than to any basic deficiencies in the programs themselves. Indeed, all of the maritime studies, except one—the Interagency Maritime Task Force Report—seem to agree with that conclusion.

In any hearings which our committee may hold on this subject, I intend to investigate as fully as possible the underlying reasons for the persistent and continual administrative inertia that has, unfortunately, characterized our maritime programs.

Recently the thought has been advanced that the revolutionary ideas proposed by the present Maritime Administrator have accomplished one very worthwhile and beneficial purpose—if nothing else—they have caused the industry to think.

Obviously, I must agree, as I expect anyone would, that thought is good. Such platitudes, however, do not allay my concern for those who would seek to deviate from or to destroy our basic maritime legislative program.

Thought without action in a commercial industry is merely stultifying. We are not attempting to develop a group of philosophers.

A diagnosis without a cure or continuous deliberation without a decision eventually will produce stagnation and prevent any progress.

I am fearful that the present chaotic and frenzied state of affairs has produced harmful rather than beneficial results.

Announced confusion over the administration of our maritime programs has created uncertainty.

A prospect that domestic operators may be allowed to construct vessels abroad certainly discourages new construction by such operators in domestic shipyards.

The threat that our cargo preference laws may be repealed hinders new construction by operators of bulk carrier vessels.

These vagaries in our own maritime program have impeded the development of the American merchant marine and have unwittingly given encouragement to the merchant marines of other nations.

The Maritime Administrator keeps calling for something new—the miracle that will solve all of our problems. I see many new developments, especially in the area of nuclear propulsion and containerization—but I see virtually no action by the Maritime Administration.

Six years ago I introduced a bill, to encourage the construction of nuclear merchant vessels, as the second phase of our nuclear ship program, but I have heard of little interest in this field by the Maritime Administration.

How new must something be to whet the whistle of those who chase the rainbow? Perhaps even nuclear propulsion is now too antedated for them and some more exotic technological change is sought.

Let us return to reality.

The United States has spent a large amount of money to develop what is still the world's only commercial nuclear vessel—the *N.S. Savannah*.

That vessel is now outmoded, as we know it soon would be.

Yet the money has been wisely spent, if we move ahead promptly in the second phase of our nuclear ship program which will be far less expensive than the first. If we do not move ahead, the substantial moneys that have been expended will have been wasted.

I believe that we are now on the verge of a technological breakthrough, in the construction of nuclear propelled merchant vessels. Nuclear propulsion is no longer a fanciful dream, or something that is not economically feasible.

We have the present ability to create a fleet of large, fast, nuclear-powered ships, which by their size, speed and ability to load and discharge, could, in a comparatively short time, dominate the point-to-point common carrier movement of the world's commerce.

I believe that a program designed to provide support for a minimum number of nuclear-propelled vessels must be commended immediately in American shipyards. There is at least one American-flag operator ready and willing to pursue such a program, and I am confident that others will follow.

At the present time, the United States has a temporary advantage in the field of nuclear propulsion, but the real advantage will be ours, only if we capitalize on it.

Foreign operators are not encumbered by the type of inertia that prevails in our maritime program and they will eventually move forward. The Germans are now building the *Otto Hahn*, a nuclear bulk carrier, and the Japanese are contracting for a nuclear propelled oceanographic vessel. The Russians have the *Lenin*, a large nuclear icebreaker. These are the foreign equivalents of the *N.S. Savannah*, except, that at least two of these foreign nuclear vessels already incorporate reactor designs that I am informed are superior to the *Savannah*.

Ironically enough, these foreign reactor designs were derived directly from our own maritime reactor program.

If we are to maintain our lead in maritime nuclear power, and simultaneously to capitalize upon current developments in ocean transportation, we must make a decision now—thinking about it is not enough.

March 7, 1966

A1217

without a country to indulge in sneaky tricks.

The crux of the matter is that Nkrumah condemned Prof. Kofi Abrefa Busia, one of the most brilliant Africans, Komla Agbelli Gbedemah, our most able politician, and other Ghanalans to the same fate he faces now and does not like the idea in the least. He is, in effect, tasting his own medicine and feels the tang of the bitterness of it.

What does Sekou Toure hope to achieve by acceding to such a preposterous idea and step down as President? This is obvious if the situation of Africa is known.

Sekou Toure, like many other African leaders, is not secure in his own country. It is a fact which is well-guarded. His fear is to avoid the fate which befalls all ambitious people—overthrow; the fate which Nkrumah has suffered.

Besides, Sekou Toure, Modibo Kelta of Mali as well as many other African leaders, are not very sure of their footing in the world politics without Nkrumah's guidance. (This is the reason for Nkrumah having little regard for their intelligence.) They follow in Nkrumah's footsteps like faithful dogs. Without Nkrumah to dictate and direct their affairs, they are like toddlers who do not understand the world about them and are therefore unable to decide things for themselves.

Sekou Toure wants Nkrumah in power—in Ghana, that is—to continue following him like the faithful dog he is. It is at once selfish and uninspired.

If Sekou Toure fails—as he is bound to—in this strategy, what does he expect to do? Nothing much as far as can be seen. While desperation may force both Nkrumah and Sekou Toure to some rash action, war with Ghana has to be ruled out. Apart from the inferior equipment and ill-training of the Guinean Army as compared to that of Ghana, an army from Guinea will have to cross the Ivory Coast which divides the two countries. This is something too farfetched to be believed since Nkrumah and Houphouet-Boigny, President of the Ivory Coast, never saw eye to eye. Besides, war is the last thing any African leader thinks about.

What may not be ruled out is harassment by Sekou Toure, Modibo Kelta and Nyerere of Tanzania of the Ghana Revolutionary Council on international platforms. What the council needs therefore, is the quick recognition due it from governments of the rest of the world—especially Western countries. This will stymie the attempts not only of Eastern countries but also of eastern-inspired and eastern-leaning countries which might want to involve themselves in the affairs of Ghana.

We are rid of a dictator and tyrant. We are rid of a regime which took us from one form of oppression to another more oppressive, more cruel and more exploiting. We are rid of a regime which was filled with liars and self-aggrandizing neosocialists.

The wish of every Ghanalan in these moments is to see a new government comprised of young, intelligent, honest and sincere people who will bring to our people the happiness and prosperity to which they are rightly entitled.

Our wish is to see a government devoted to removing the cancer of ignorance, disease and poverty which has riddled Africa for centuries and introduce the economic, political, and social possibilities which will make it possible for us to forge ahead in the world. And, by Jove, we are going to get it—in spite of the designs by other African leaders who seek to further their political ambitions at the expense of Ghana and Ghanalans.

The Insight of Carl T. Rowan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, Carl T. Rowan is one of the newer nationally syndicated columnists now commenting on national and international affairs. In my judgment, he has demonstrated over the past few months that he has sound judgments and superior writing skills. His exposition of difficult problems is always lucid, calm, and thoughtful.

In my opinion, Mr. Rowan brings some special qualifications to the commentator's art because, unlike a number of his contemporaries, Carl Rowan has rendered distinguished service to the Federal Government—as an ambassador and later as director of the U.S. Information Agency.

In short, having seen government both as a journalist and as a public official, Mr. Rowan seems to be happily free from the "beast theory" of the conduct of public affairs and in my opinion writes about men and events in terms of actuality, rather than some vague or imagined conspiracy.

I find his columns refreshing and always interesting. I call attention to his column of March 4, 1966, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, and ask unanimous consent that the column by Carl T. Rowan be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE REASON HUMPHREY EXPLODED (By Carl T. Rowan)

To understand the vigor of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY's disagreement with Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, on Vietnam, you have to understand the nuances of what HUMPHREY was doing on his Far East trip.

HUMPHREY exploded when he heard of KENNEDY's proposal that the United States promised the Vietcong a role in a future government of South Vietnam because he felt KENNEDY had undercut the major achievement of his journey.

During the summit meeting in Honolulu, President Johnson had become concerned about the delicate political situation in Saigon. He had been impressed by arguments that the talk of negotiations had frightened some powerful forces in the south. There was some danger that the government of Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky would collapse if it were not made clear that there was no scheme afoot to abandon South Vietnam to the Reds.

So HUMPHREY's first job was simple—to convince leading South Vietnamese that the United States was not going to surrender the south to Hanoi—but that neither United States nor world opinion would permit Saigon to take the truculent attitude of opposing negotiations.

HUMPHREY left Saigon feeling that he had calmed South Vietnamese anxieties and convinced Saigon of the desirability of a peaceful settlement. Then, in New Zealand, he saw KENNEDY's proposal for a coalition.

"Oh, no," he reportedly exclaimed, "this will frighten the South Vietnamese to death."

Without waiting for instructions from Washington, he denounced the idea of putting Communists in the Saigon government as like "putting a fox in a chicken coop."

Back home, the Vice President has told intimates that he wants to avoid a fight with KENNEDY "but I can't remain silent in the face of talk that is so stupid. No labor organizer in his right mind would announce before negotiations what he was prepared to give up. It's like saying publicly that you don't really want a strong organization to represent the workers but you'd be satisfied with just a little company union."

Johnson also is eager to avoid an open fight with KENNEDY, which is why so many people spent so many hours trying to gloss over KENNEDY's initial break with the administration.

But in private, top members of the Johnson team express their irritation with KENNEDY by asserting that he is "only after the headlines."

They point out that KENNEDY had access to the most sensitive intelligence information and knows that the Vietcong is simply the instrument through which Hanoi set out to conquer South Vietnam.

Administration spokesmen show particular irritation when they ask, "Why didn't KENNEDY propose the coalition 3 years ago when he could have shared the responsibility for it?"

As for other aspects of the Vice President's travels, I reported on January 7, after his early trip, that he had arranged for greater Asian involvement in the war—if the peace offensive failed. The Koreans have just announced that 25,000 more troops are going to Vietnam. And Philippines President Ferdinand E. Marcos, who a year ago opposed involvement of even a Filipino engineers unit in Vietnam, has disclosed that HUMPHREY convinced him he ought to send Filipino troops to South Vietnam.

One of the most important and unpublicized achievements of the Vice President's recent mission was to arrange to keep channels of communications open to Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow.

The war plans are being stepped up but the Vice President arranged that—through the Pakistanis to the Chinese, through the Indians to the Russians, and through some delicate channels directly to Hanoi—the olive branch is to be constantly dangled.

If a peaceful settlement of this wretched war is achieved, it very likely will be because of communications through these channels—but surely not because of any widely debated proposals and gestures on the American political scene.

Changing Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when nationwide, in fact worldwide, at-

attention is focused upon assisting hungry nations, the outstanding editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star just yesterday, March 6, is of particular interest. The editorial by Rod Turnbull, the Star's agricultural editor, discusses world food needs and the possible effect on domestic farm plans. As he states, "Once a commitment has been made, it will be difficult to turn back."

Mr. Turnbull is widely recognized for his knowledge of agriculture and, without question, one of the Nation's top agricultural editors. I believe everyone will agree his editorial is an exceptional one.

FARM SURPLUSES FALL AS A VICTIM OF DEMAND

Recently an executive of a wheat-grower organization wrote to his members: "If someone had said to me 2 years ago 'your excess supplies of wheat would be gone by July 1, 1966,' I would have said, 'Listen Bud, you have your head in the clouds.'"

"This comment illustrates the national surprise over the apparent disappearance of the U.S. farm surplus problem. No doubt it has come as a surprise—if in fact we can say that the surpluses are gone.

Actually, it does seem as if all at once authorities are speaking of our farm surpluses as something in the past and are referring to stockpiles as reserves, rather than problems. Certainly this wasn't the attitude even less than a year ago, when the 1965 farm act was passed by Congress. The new law provided for still greater reductions in acreages to control production.

Now, in contrast, the Department of Agriculture is ever so slightly loosening some of the reins on production in 1966. Also there are people who propose that this country had better hurriedly return to using its idle acres before we run into serious worldwide food problems.

What happened? How could the change come so fast as between surplus piles and reserves, or even shortages?

It is a long story, difficult to explain in all its details. But in the main, the big change that has come faster than most people anticipated has been in demand, both domestic and worldwide, and in both the dollar markets and our giveaway programs.

A second major shift has been in attitude, perhaps induced by the rapidly expanding demand. Surpluses are not measured entirely in pounds or bushels alone, we are learning. Another factor is whether the public or the market regards a certain quantity as a surplus or a reserve.

For any valid assessment of the current situation as to surpluses versus reserves, it should be kept in mind that this country has substantial stocks of grains on hand. Estimates are being made that as of July 1 this year the wheat surplus may be down to 600 million bushels. This would be the carryover of wheat on hand as the new harvest began. Incidentally, that 600-million figure is one often proposed as the amount this country always should have in reserve—it is approximately what we use annually at home for food and seed.

The United States never had a carryover of 600 million bushels until 1940. This amount was depleted during the war years and the total did not get back up to the 600-million figure again until 1953. We will also have more than a billion bushels in corn on hand next October 1. Again, the carryover of this feed grain never in all history reached a billion bushels until 1955. So we're not yet scratching the bottom of the barrel when it comes to supplies of these grains. That circumstance, indeed, is one thing that has the administration worried. It fears that demand for increasing production will break the dike again and bring about a return of

surplus piles before an absolute outlet for all can be assured.

The surplus piles, which have impressed themselves so much upon the Nation, grew in the late 1950's. The decisive jump in carryover wheat stocks came after the huge 1958 crop of 1,457,435,000 bushels. Incidentally, the average per-acre yield that year was 27.5 bushels, a figure never achieved before nor since. The wheat carryover continued to grow until 1961 when it peaked at 1,411 million bushels. As mentioned, predictions are that it will be at around 600 million bushels this July 1.

The feed grain surplus likewise grew in the 1950's, reaching a top of 4,700,000 tons in 1961. It is expected to be at around 6 million tons this next October. Strangely enough, while the feed grain yields were large in the 1950's, they have been even larger in the 1960's, with alltime records set in 1965 on corn, oats, barley and grain sorghums.

The surpluses accumulated, obviously, because production was greater than consumption. In turn, the surplus piles are growing smaller now for the simple reason that larger amounts of the grain are being consumed.

The reasons why are impressive and their development, which seems to have caught so many by surprise, is interesting.

The one word that describes the situation still is demand.

Demand has skyrocketed because of, among other things:

Prosperity in the advanced nations of the world.

High needs in the less-advanced nations of the world.

The rapidly increasing world population.

On the opposite side of demand significant developments have included short wheat crops in both Australia and Argentina, traditionally important exporting nations.

Not to be overlooked is the shock that came to the world when the Soviet Union, a former exporter, had to buy wheat in huge quantities.

Balanced against all the indications of increasing demand is the realization that the only major grain surplus-producing area in the world is North America—the United States and Canada.

All these factors together have changed attitudes on just what constitutes a surplus. In other words, a given quantity of wheat or corn doesn't appear so big or market-frightening as it did some years ago.

Now as for these forces that are skyrocketing demand. It will be observed that many are interrelated.

First, world prosperity, which affects the United States and most of the other advanced nations.

In this country the utilization of feed grains, 85 percent of which go for livestock and poultry feed, has been rising markedly since the middle 1950's. Both population growth and prosperity have contributed to such expanding use. In the marketing year 1954-55, the United States required 89,700,000 tons of feed grains to feed its livestock. This year an estimate is that the corresponding utilization will be 119,100,000 tons.

But even more dramatic—and greater in percentage—has been the increase of feed grain exports. They, too, began to rise in the middle 1950's. The total in 1954-55 was 5½ million tons. Without an exception there has been an increase each year since then. And in 1966 the total should reach an amazing 25 million tons.

The major feed grain is corn. A 3-billion-bushel crop used to be considered a big one for the United States. All through the 1950's, when surpluses were building up, the corn crops were running above 3 billion and approaching 4 billion. Our first 4-billion-bushel crop was harvested in 1963.

Last year, an alltime record was set with 4,171 million bushels. The significant point

is that we apparently are going to use it all this year, domestically and in exports. The carryover next October 1 will be approximately 1,200 million bushels, or just about the same as it was on the same date a year ago. A record crop, but no increase in surplus.

More poultry, more livestock in Europe and Japan spell big business for U.S. feed grain exporters. People in the countries are, as we say in the United States, eating higher on the hog. The first part of this year, for example, combined exports of grain sorghums and corn to Italy were up 70 percent over the same period in the previous year. Japan is the No. 1 importer of U.S. corn and soybeans and its take of these two grains was up 60 percent the first quarter of this year. Spain, West Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium all are taking more and more. American salesmanship has something to do with this boost in trade, but general prosperity can't be discounted.

Hardly anybody back in 1955 would have predicted totals in exports that are being experienced today. There were authorities at that time, however, who were contending that the way to get rid of surpluses was to get out and sell them.

The feed grain exports go mostly for dollars. It is a different story with wheat. But the effect on the surplus pile is the same. The United States has been sending more and more wheat abroad since 1955. Here poverty and famine in the world are dominating factors. In the current year the total may reach 900 million bushels. A major part of this will be under the Public Law 480 program, even though our dollar exports have been increasing also. Domestic consumption, plus exports, will require some 200 million more bushels of wheat than the United States raised last year.

It will be observed from the foregoing data that the utilization of grain produced in this country took an appreciable upward trend in the middle 1950's which not only has continued to this day, but appears to be accelerating. At the same time we have had a farm program which has taken some 50 to 60 million acres out of production. This decrease must have had some effect on production, even when record yields were being experienced. Farmers in the Corn Belt, it has been estimated, have almost doubled their use of fertilizer since 1960.

To whatever extent the farm program has checked total yields, it has helped, along with greater utilization, to reduce the surplus piles.

Thus we find ourselves today with surpluses in smaller quantities than was the case a few years ago. Plus the fact that because of current and pending demand, a given quantity of surplus doesn't frighten us as much as before. With this new situation in regard to surpluses, we face new decisions on how to proceed in agriculture.

One major decision must be on how much we intend to commit to the hungry nations of the world. The result will have its effect on all farm plans. Once a commitment has been made, it will be difficult to turn back.

After deciding what we intend to supply to the hungry nations then, since we have a Government-planned agriculture, it will be up to the administration to determine what the production acreage should be and what reserves should be maintained. The assumption now is that acreage controls will be relaxed to some extent, with possibly all restrictions on plantings removed by 1975.

The weather remains an unknown factor. We have experienced in recent years perhaps the best crop-growing period in recent history. Suppose there is a trend the other way?

It will take a master hand on the controls lever to determine just what acreage is needed in the various crops which have been under Government guidance but which

A1244

find more nonessential areas in which to do it rather than take a chance on cutting down and into our wisest investment in the future of America, the encouragement of a healthy, well-nourished, wholesome, American youth, in the best educational environment we can devise.

Our Greek Lesson Applies to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Seymour Freidin has pointed out in the following article from the February 26, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune that the situation we face in Vietnam today is directly analogous to that we faced in postwar Greece when the Truman doctrine saved that nation from certain Communist takeover.

Mr. Freidin's article is very much to the point and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

OUR GREEK LESSONS APPLY TO VIETNAM
 (By Seymour Freidin)

SAIGON.—This is a war the Vietnamese must fight and win, with help, but none of the choleric critics and self-appointed peacemakers abroad really consider them.

After 20 years of bloodletting and terror there is a pronounced battle fatigue. But the people of South Vietnam show no sign that they are ready to yield. Indeed, if they didn't have the will to persist, all Vietnam would by now have been in Communist hands.

This fact has been ignored by the critics as they search for methods of bypassing the South Vietnamese.

The determination to assure social reform, the vast military operation—which confounds the Communists—and the projects for pacifying South Vietnam are really just beginning. Their successful completion requires time, stamina, and comprehension.

U.S. forces speak with assurance and admiration of the Vietnamese and the future of their country. The Americans here are quite a new breed from those we knew in World War II. They are, in the main, knowledgeable and compassionate. Moreover, they know why they are here.

A realization, therefore, has grown rapidly that the nearest parallel to South Vietnam in contemporary history is that of postwar Greece. There, Communist guerrillas included combat forces and highly organized, tightly discipline political activists.

Desperately poor, the country depended on its tough-willed but have-not rural population to power the economy. By the time the Truman doctrine was promulgated nearly 20 years ago, the Greek Government was most unpopular and inept.

Having been short circuited immediately after the war by the direct role of Winston Churchill, Communist cadres cached weapons and munitions. They had a huge frontier sanctuary across the Albanian, Yugoslav, and Bulgar borders. Soon they were falling upon mountain villages, exacting bloody reprisals and exorbitant taxes and ransom. Government forces were riddled with intrigue and bad leadership. The nation had avaricious politicians to match.

When we came to Greece, after Britain bowed out due to exhausted resources, Communist guerrillas were at the gates of Athens. Our first move was to try and pour tangible aid into the country. Profiteering commenced and corruption spread.

Sound familiar? There were the critics of the "Truman intervention" who said Greece was too far gone and that we didn't belong there anyway. Gradually, the whole program was upgraded, emphasizing security and social reform.

With the rejuvenation came a governmental and military shakeup. Marshal Papagos became the take-charge man for Greece. We sent in skilled officers, who worked down to the company level with a reformed Greek Army that went out to seek and destroy the guerrillas and their nationwide network.

In mid-civil war, Tito, having broken with Stalin, closed his borders to the Greek guerrillas, sealing their doom. But before that, assistance teams went out to the remotest, most wretched hamlets and worked at reform, which the Communists always tried to prevent.

The lamenters and the cynics declared that the Greek-American plan couldn't possibly work; that the Communists were riding the wave of revolution. Moreover, they worried, the Soviet Union could not stand by idly and see our presence so near.

What happened in Greece is history. Lots of the same treatment—curing social injustice and, above all, providing security—is on the way to Vietnam now.

The Government has a chance under Nguyen Cao Ky. He is young and impatient but intelligent. Ky knows that the real battlefield is reform and development. To win takes time. The Vietnamese know it. So should we. Greece is our shining example.

"Job Center To Be Reality"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, businessmen the country over are taking an increasingly active role in the War on Poverty. As an example of this fact, I cite an article appearing in the Omaha, Nebr., World-Herald of February 20, dealing with the efforts of one Omaha businessman, J. O. Grantham, director of long-range manpower planning for the Northern Natural Gas Co., to help secure a men's Job Corps center at the Lincoln, Nebr., Air Force Base.

I commend this article to my colleagues:

JOB CENTER TO BE REALITY—OMAHAN SAYS LINCOLN WILL GET APPROVAL

The Omaha spearheading a drive to create a men's Job Corps center at the Lincoln Air Force Base said Saturday he is confident the center will be approved.

J. O. Grantham, director of long-range man power planning for the Northern Natural Gas Co., said he hopes the remaining hurdles can be cleared Tuesday when two Federal Job Corps officials from Washington spend the day in Omaha and Lincoln.

Mr. Grantham said he feels the Federal Government no longer questions the capability of Northern and the University of Nebraska to start and successfully operate the center.

But Federal officials aren't satisfied with the proposed educational program, he said, specifically in these areas:

How the basic education of the corpsmen will fit into their vocational training.

How their 24-hour living schedule will fit into the vocational training.

How Northern and NU will train the staff to work with corpsmen, most of whom are school dropouts.

How Northern and NU plan to improve the program as it goes along.

If the Federal Government wasn't interested in creating the center, it wouldn't send Drs. Ray Keating and Chester Hall here Tuesday for further talks after days of discussions in Washington last week, Mr. Grantham said.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is proceeding slowly in creating new centers, he said. It has had time to evaluate weaknesses in its first centers and is eliminating them before opening new ones, he said.

Mr. Grantham said the proposed center, which would open next summer, has more potential significance to Nebraska than just its economic impact on Lincoln.

The number of top staff personnel it would attract and trained corpsmen it would produce could be a significant factor in attracting new industry to the State, he said.

Jets Broaden Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Marion Sadler, president of American Airlines, addressed the Rotary Club of Rochester, N.Y., on March 1. In reporting this important talk, both the Rochester Times-Union and the Democrat and Chronicle emphasized the importance of direct air service in expanding domestic markets and developing foreign markets. Particular emphasis was focused on the expanding markets in the Far East.

The airline president told members of the Rotary Club that American, along with most other air carriers was receiving a great many new jet aircraft, making it possible for American to improve service to Chicago, New York, and other cities.

Mr. Speaker, because of its interest to my colleagues, especially those serving communities having similar industrial and commercial roles to those of Rochester, I am pleased to have Mr. Sadler's excellent speech published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ROCHESTER AND THE SUPERSONIC AGE
 (By Marion Sadler, president, American Airlines, Inc., before the Rotary Club, Rochester, N.Y., Mar. 1, 1966)

I thank you for inviting me to be with you today. It is good to be in Rochester, and it is good to be at Rotary.

For 5 years, I was an active member of Rotary in Buffalo, and my father was an early president of the Rotary Club in Clarksville, Tenn., soon after World War I. I sort of grew up with Rotary, and I regard it as a privilege to be able to break bread and talk with you Rochester Rotarians today.

March 7, 1966

A1243

for other policies where our leadership is still in dispute.

The formula program has made agricultural research in the States most successful. This is because it provided a continuity of research support and therefore made it possible to keep highly qualified personnel. Genetic research such as you describe in your letter would have found less success if carried on with grant funds rather than formula funds because of the long-term nature of the research. It is an example of research maintained successfully by a station only because of the confidence in the ability to fund long-term research. This confidence was based largely upon our history of formula funding. The continuing aspect of this program is a principal source of its strength. We feel that any attempt to trade formula funds for grant funds would be a violation of the original philosophy contained in the Hatch appropriation and would jeopardize the continuity which has made the Hatch program so effective.

Turning to specifics defined in your letter, we are prompted to remind you of the long history of the Minnesota Experiment Station in water research, toxicoses, and our current heavy involvement in studies involving various mycotoxins as they affect livestock and humans. This important work has been carried on with the assistance of Hatch funds and, as you indicate, deserves continued attention and support. In addition, Minnesota has had a long history of State support for plant protein research. We fear that a reduction in experiment station funds might shift priorities and threaten this vital and ongoing research.

We are cognizant of increasing national interest in the area of resource development. Forestry is obviously an important portion of this field of study. We feel it important that McIntire-Stennis funds be increased to allow additional work in this area.

While we recognize that at a Federal level priorities can be addressed to agricultural research, we would hope that it be recognized that the same process operates at a State level. We would hope, too, that it would be apparent that the tradition of research in the State, the strengths of research staff, and the needs and desires of the people of a specific State are strong directives in formulating these priorities. We like to feel that our 15- to 20-percent adjustment in program each year, arrived at in consultation with USDA, represents a diligent and responsible effort to address ourselves to tasks of current importance.

We hope that our concern for the proposed cuts in USDA research expenditures has been made clear. Further, we hope that possible shifts in the method of deployment of these funds will be reconsidered. We strongly urge that the serious concerns of this institution and our sister institutions throughout the country will prompt a restoration of a budget that makes possible the research in State universities and colleges that is so obviously important to the health of the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

*) MEREDITH WILSON,
President.

P.S.—I am sending a copy of this letter to Dean Sherwood O. Berg, with the request that he provide you specific information regarding the impact on University of Minnesota programs.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
 Washington, D.C., January 26, 1966.
 President O. MEREDITH WILSON,
 University of Minnesota,
 Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR PRESIDENT WILSON: This letter is to inform you about this Department's 1967 budget proposals. These include funds for support of research in the State agriculture experiment stations, cooperative State forestry schools, and funds for project grants ad-

ministered by the Cooperative State Research Service.

We are asking for increased project grant funds to support research on problems of highest priority in States where such support can be gotten most effectively. Specific areas for new research emphasis will include more efficient use of water, ways of eliminating food poisoning and toxin-producing organisms from our food supply and other issues of pressing importance.

Increased support is proposed for research on plant proteins, including soybeans, to help expand markets and to contribute to world protein food needs. Some new funds are requested to accelerate research on the role of cooperatives in farm marketing systems.

Funds are included to continue project grant support for research to find ways of reducing the costs of producing and marketing cotton.

This new research will all contribute to achieving the missions and goals that this Nation has set out.

Of special importance to one of these goals, about \$1 million are requested for the first time to support research in the 16 former Negro land-grant colleges. They now have little research support from any source. They provide training for a rapidly increasing number of students, presently about 40,000. Provision of research support for their faculties is essential to their further growth in excellence. The research to be supported will be responsive to the needs of the rural communities from which their students come.

Support for forestry research under the McIntire-Stennis Act complements that of the Forest Service. This new research program is off to a very good start. It will provide a much-needed increase in the supply of trained research people for all our forest-related activities. It will speed the research results needed in the several States. Funds asked for this area of research are continued at the 1966 level, \$2.5 million.

We are determined to continue support to the research in the State agricultural experiment stations. We will continue to work with them to make that research even more productive, to further improve its quality, and to assure its concentration on research of highest priority.

The research at the State agricultural experiment stations which is supported by funds appropriated under the Hatch Act and by State appropriated funds continues to make outstanding contributions to the solution of agriculture's problems. For example, a recent discovery has been made at the Indiana Agricultural Experiment Station at Purdue. Genetic research there has developed corn breeding lines and hybrids which are high in protein. This discovery may be epochal not only for the feeding of pigs and poultry, but for people for whom corn is an important food, too.

Adjustments proposed in the 1967 estimates will permit continuation of research on such urgent problems as pesticides for which the Congress provided special funds in 1965 and on other problems of high priority.

We have always emphasized the necessity for elimination of research of low priority. About 20 percent of all projects terminate each year. Many of these are replaced by projects in new areas. This year's budget proposals for funds under the Hatch Act reflect this continuing policy by a proposed reduction of \$8.5 million. This reduction amounts to only about 4 percent of funds from all sources available to the State agricultural experiment stations.

While it will necessitate elimination of low-priority research, remaining funds and the new grant research funds can accelerate needed concentration on high-priority problems.

The long-range study of research needs now underway will more clearly identify

areas of greatest urgency for future budgetary consideration.

The administration is determined to support research needed for economic growth and for human welfare. We will find within our current funds as much of that needed for research as we can. Pruning out low-priority research will make the new growth more fruitful.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

The School Lunch and Special Milk Programs Are Vital to the Continuing Good Health and Proper Education of American Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, like a good many colleagues here I am very deeply concerned about and very deeply and earnestly question the economic urgency and wisdom of the Administration's request for apparent major reductions in the appropriations for federally impacted areas and the school lunch and special milk programs that have, over these past several years, been so healthfully enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of American children.

The President himself has said that, "a poor diet is a root cause of disease." I am sure that every American agrees with him in that statement.

The school milk program is of vital importance for our school youngsters because, according to all of the authorities, milk contains nutrients essential for good health. They further tell us that milk is a basic factor in building proper diet habits. And even further, we all know that a well-nourished child learns better than an undernourished child.

The school officials themselves testify to us that the proposal to distribute the milk and limit the program on the basis of need is both impractical and unworkable. Under this proposal it would seem that school administrators would be asked to separate the students whose parents have a low level of income from those who are assumed to be able to afford to buy the milk. This certainly appears to be inducing school officials to do something our schools are not set up to do and it is also quite likely to create an artificial barrier between and among the students.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion our school-lunch and milk program is basically and primarily a health program, not a welfare program. The savings projected in the proposed appropriation reductions are so small in comparison with some of our overly generous expenditures for projects and programs in other countries and other people all over the world that they appear unjustifiable on any normal, economic or practical standards.

Whatever the need, and I think there is real need, to sensibly restrict Government expenditures, I would hope we can

A1248

This is representative of several similar news articles that have appeared throughout the 19 counties in the Seventh Iowa District. It indicates a strong support by the farmers in our area of this program.

I feel it is important to get this information before my colleagues so they will not be misled by uninformed news media.

The article follows:

SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THREE SIGNED UP FOR FEED GRAIN PLAN
 (By Donald H. Severin)

A total of 633 farmers have signed up for the 1966 feed grain program. This compares favorably with last year so far. The sign-up by township in past years got about half the signers and 2 or 3 weeks before the deadline another 600 or 700 sign up. The sign-up period this year ends on April 1.

Many farmers have mentioned they like the feed grain program this year because it is more flexible. It is designed so farmers can plant whole fields of corn or divert whole fields. Last year farmers had to plant all of the permitted corn acres or take a reduction in payment. This year farmers can substitute soybeans for corn on all of the permitted corn acres. For example a farmer with a 100-acre corn base could divert 20 acres and grow 80 acres of soybeans with no reduction in feed grain payments.

This year farmers can divert from 20 to 50 percent of the corn base. Since the payment for diverting more than 20 percent is high many farmers have diverted more than 20 percent. For example, a farmer with a 100-acre corn base might have a 25-acre field to divert. This extra 5 acres above the first 20 percent would earn about \$60 per acre. Farmers wanting more details can talk to a township committeeman or call at the ASCS office.

Farmers have signed up for a number of ACP practices they plan to start this spring including tile, terraces, ponds, and windbreaks. With the open winter, a number of farmers have already spread lime. For lime the payment is 50 percent of the cost or no more than \$8 per acre. The field limed must be seeded down for two consecutive years.

Several farmers have signed up for windbreak practice around farm buildings. Probably due to the rather mild weather and little snow farmers haven't felt the need for a good windbreak around the farm. This practice has a good payment rate. The trees and shrubs must be ordered from a commercial nursery.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the voice of democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies' auxiliary is one of the finest programs offered the youth of this Nation.

I am especially proud that the winning speech from Kansas this year was delivered by one of my constituents, Mr. Bill Ray Hutchison, of Chanute, Kans.

Reading his oration reinforces my faith in the teenage generation of Amer-

ica. We often read the headlines about the young anti-Vietnam demonstrators whose militant individualism leads to a general rejection of traditional morality. However, I am convinced these are a small minority who blacken the name of the dedicated, hardworking, clear-thinking majority.

I suggest that anyone who has doubts as to the direction our younger generation is headed should read this young man's speech. Listen to what he says about democracy and what it means to him; see how he feels to be an American.

It may not make the headlines, but you can be sure it is a much truer reflection of the pulse of young America than that you read in the morning paper.

The speech follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Bill Ray Hutchison, Chanute, Kans.)

A 17-year-old American girl brings honor to her country by her victories in Olympic swimming competition. An 18-year-old chemistry student gives the patent rights of his new process to the Government. An outstanding high school leader inspires the Nation by voicing his views of democracy. Freedom means a lot to these young people, and they dedicate their superior talents to make that freedom better because of their sacrifices. I feel that same desire to make America stronger, and I have a job to do in this democracy.

I don't have a vote, so my part is to encourage others to vote, both by words and by action. I am willing to give rides or babysit to allow others to vote. This is not being entirely selfless. After all, people are squandering my freedom, too, when they "take the liberty," as it were, to stay home on election day. I cannot live in my own one-man democracy, so I must encourage others to help preserve the freedom we live in.

So even as a high school student, I have a place to fill in democracy to keep it alive and working. I am studying to gain an appreciation for my heritage, to learn of the Government's institutions and methods, to gain an understanding of my duties and privileges as a citizen, and to become a productive member of our free society. In short, I am learning about the freedom I have. After all, I really don't have total freedom until I know all the things I am free to do. A football player who is not sure about all the rules severely limits his actions to avoid breaking a rule. And he can't contribute much to the game, just as I can't contribute much to our democracy if I don't know all of its rules.

Book-learning, however, is not enough by itself. The nature of democracy calls for action. I belong to the school service club, which builds character and serves the community and Nation by its projects. I represent a class of students on the student council, our own democratic system. In this position of trust, I work to change procedures or policies when they are not in line with democratic principles or when the change would benefit the group, for we protect our democracy by using it fully. If we practice only following the directions of teachers and administrators, we cannot expect to step out into the world ready to live in a democratic community.

If our generation is to keep America strong and free, we must be willing to participate in our Government. Of course, everyone can't be in public office, but we all play a part in Government. That's what makes this a democracy. Each of our representatives in the governing body needs an indication of his area's thinking. Letters from electors do not give an accurate consensus, because most Americans of this era seldom write their leaders unless they have definite

feelings against an issue. Lord Bryce, in his "American Commonwealth," said Americans were concerned when opposing a piece of legislation, but were, as he put it, "timid in advocacy as well as infantile in suggestion."

What we need in more consciousness of our freedom in our everyday lives. Democracy isn't limited to politics. Real freedom manifests itself, in for example, staying within even the unreasonable speed limit, dropping papers in a trash can instead of on the street, and choosing to put savings in Government bonds instead of a bank account. Then democracy begins to mean more. We begin to thank God for our America and pray for guidance for its leaders. We might join the organization, people-to-people, to make another friend for ourselves and our country through the mail. When the flag goes by in a parade, we will salute it and show everyone we are proud of our country. There are many ways of practicing our freedom if we will become aware of them.

Our America can become the country whose leaders know what the electors want, a country whose flag passes with the salutations of its proud and free people, a country whose citizens are vigorous in advocacy as well as aggressive in suggestion. Our generation will become the freest people in the world if we take another look at the freedom we have.

Long, Hard Road in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, in a February 28 editorial the Baltimore Sun points out that President Johnson can help to keep the war in Vietnam in perspective by reiterating what he said during a recent press conference that "now we will have a long and hard road," in Vietnam.

The Sun editorial quotes the President to the effect that the war in Vietnam is not going to be easy or short; it is going to be difficult and it is going to require sacrifices.

The Sun points out:

A necessary part of this summing up is Mr. Johnson's emphasis on the point that the United States' objectives are limited—to defeat the act of aggression against South Vietnam, to search for an honorable and just peace and to try to establish a stable, democratic government.

In the conviction that others will find the Sun's lucid editorial a clarification of the issues facing us, I am offering it to the RECORD, where the article may be read in its entirety:

LONG, HARD ROAD

President Johnson can also help to keep the war in Vietnam in perspective, and he can expect firm and steady support from the American people, by reiterating what he said during his Saturday press conference: "Now we will have a long and hard road."

As the President said further, it is not going to be easy or short; it is going to be difficult and it is going to require sacrifices. A necessary part of this summing up is Mr. Johnson's emphasis on the point that the U.S. objectives are limited—to defeat the act of aggression against South Vietnam, to search for an honorable and just

March 7, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1247

Inequities of the Draft**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern in the country about the efficiency and adequacy of our present system of obtaining necessary military manpower. We have seen too many examples of inequities and inefficiencies; we have seen too many instances of poor planning and lack of priorities in our draft calls.

Last week I was proud to join with a number of my Republican colleagues in pointing out some of the present shortcomings and in calling for a thorough congressional investigation of the Selective Service System. I am pleased that the House Armed Services Committee will give its attention to this subject within the near future.

On Sunday, Martin F. Nolan, of the Boston Globe Washington bureau, summarized the recent comments on the draft and discussed a number of proposals that have been made for its improvement.

Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

NEW FACTOR IN VIETNAM DEBATE: INEQUITIES OF THE DRAFT

(By Martin F. Nolan)

WASHINGTON.—Shortly after Gen. Matthew B. Ridgeway took command of U.S. troops in Korea in 1951, he said: "In my brief period of command duty here I have heard from several sources, chiefly from the members of combat units, the questions 'Why are we here?' 'What are we fighting for?'"

"The answer to the first question," Ridgeway said, "is conclusive because the loyalty we give, and expect, precludes any slightest questioning."

"The second question is of much greater significance," he added. "The real issues are whether or not the power of Western civilization, as God has permitted it to flower in our own beloved lands, shall defy and defeat communism."

In Vietnam and over here, the same questions are being asked today.

It seems unlikely that Gen. William C. Westmoreland, however much he would agree with Ridgeway's first answer, would adopt the apocalyptic view of the second.

A changing American attitude toward the fulfillability of American foreign policy, new appraisals of the supposedly monolithic menace of conspiratorial communism—many factors have changed the Nation's attitude toward its goals of war.

None, however, has been as profound or as symptomatic as the changing American attitude toward the military draft.

Debate on the draft provides a curious counterpoint to debate on the war in Vietnam. Sometimes the discussions coincide, sometimes not. In either case, the draft remains a key political issue, at least in living rooms where teenage sons reside.

Last week, 30 Republican Congressmen—some liberal members of the Wednesday Club, some not so liberal—urged an investigation of the Nation's 25-year-old system of procuring military manpower. In doing so, they enraged neither hawks nor doves.

One of the least-noticed comments of Sen-

ator ROBERT F. KENNEDY in his celebrated February 19 statement on Vietnam was his reference to inequities in the draft.

"The war perpetuates discrimination," KENNEDY said, "for the poor and the less fortunate serve in Vietnam out of all proportion to their numbers in the United States as a whole."

Negroes, who comprise about 10 percent of the Nation's population, provide 14 percent of the Army's total manpower, according to Pentagon statistics. But Negroes make up but 3.5 percent of the Army's officers.

Self-evident flaws and subtle ones, glaring injustices and petty mistakes—Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey dismisses them all with characteristic bluntness: "Absolute equity has never been attained." The father of the draft, its custodian and most vigorous defender, thus huris an implicit challenge at his critics: Do something better.

One of them has. John U. Monro, dean of Harvard College, suggests a national lottery to choose draftees. Dean Monro sees luck as a more suitable standard for his students than the present Selective Service plan of making the bottom half of freshman students available for the draft.

The lottery has all the statistical logic of and automobile accident. But its prestigious sponsorship alone will bring discussion of the draft into clearer focus, as well as provide a clear-eyed view of the war in Vietnam.

A lottery does not ask the question: Which is more important, education or war? A lottery is indiscriminate, but so is the war. The Selective Service System, in Br'er Rabbit fashion, has been hitting away at that tar baby mass of fluctuating needs, standards and deferrals until it has become hopelessly entangled. The analogy of American involvement in Vietnam to the moral of this Uncle Remus tale is clear.

General Hershey, who has not gone out of his way to please professors, may find his academic adversaries more formidable now than ever before. During the Korean war domestic hysteria made professors suspect; no billboards proclaimed then that "College Is America's Best Friend." Now, they do and it is.

The drafting of college students may have an ultimate benefit of curing this problem of civilian morale and fitting conscription—as well as its cause—into the philosophy of modern America. Serious thought on the legal and moral aspects of the draft can do nothing but good.

The resources of Academe, never really used on behalf of selective service before, may help the draft law live up to its claim that "in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof, should be shared generally."

Legal Help Is Poverty Item**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. SAM GIBBONS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we continue to read and hear a great deal about legal help for the Nation's poor. I noticed an interesting story in the Escanaba Daily Press, Escanaba, Mich., of January 31 describing some action taken by the Community Action Committee of the Michigan State Bar Association to help provide such services. I commend it to my colleagues:

LEGAL HELP IS POVERTY ITEM

When the community action committee of the Star bar met in Lansing recently to consider a pilot project for providing legal services to the rural indigent, six of the seven members of the committee were urban lawyers and Walter T. Dartland of Houghton was the sole attorney from a rural area.

According to Dartland, the program would cover education on legal services to the rural indigent and provision for legal consultation and representation.

To date, especially in the Houghton-Barage-Keweenaw area, the means of providing legal services to the rural poor has not been developed past the level of largely gratuitous services by private attorneys acting voluntarily through the Copper Country Bar Association. This results, Dartland said, in a sporadic contact between the poor and the lawyer which results in an insufficient use by the rural poor of the services of an attorney.

An initial hypothesis of the project is that such services can be provided best by privately practicing attorneys within the community. It is based upon such factors as the knowledge of such attorneys of the rural community, the position they hold in the community, their geographic availability to the rural resident and their ability to resolve problems of the rural poor within the rural community.

It is expected that the Michigan Bar Association would propose that one attorney be assigned to the Upper Peninsula through UPCAP. His responsibility would be to coordinate, educate, and develop the program through the six functioning community action agencies. Each CAA would in turn request one legal social worker who would work in conjunction with the area representatives. Referrals would be made by the legal social worker to local attorneys who would be reimbursed for their services using the State bar minimum schedule and billing through UPCAP.

Research and evaluation of means of providing timely representation in misdemeanor cases will be conducted and various methods attempted to provide representation. Also included in this study will be a bail project for the purpose of obtaining release on personal bond for indigent defendants.

**Six Hundred and Thirty-three Signed Up
for Feed Grain Plan****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, there has been a clamor in the eastern press recently about a lack of enthusiasm in the Midwest for the 1966 feed grain program. This misinterpretation of the situation in my area needs to be corrected so that it will not damage the excellent program passed by Congress last year.

The tardiness of farmers to sign up for this year's program has nothing to do with a lack of support. A recent story in the Carroll Daily Times Herald by Donald H. Severin, manager of the Carroll County ASCS office, indicates that the number of farmers signing up for the 1966 program compares quite favorably with the number signed up at this time in 1965.

March 7, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1249

peace, and to try to establish a stable, democratic government. This, as he said, will take time.

If we look back for a moment, we can see that one of the worst errors in our policy in Vietnam has been the all too frequent outburst of easy optimism that has been shattered by subsequent developments. State Department reporters can remember a briefing, some 12 years ago, in which it was predicted that with increasing help from the United States the French soon would be able to put down the Vietminh. Not long thereafter the series of setbacks began which led to the defeat at Dienbienphu and the French withdrawal.

In the years since, each measure of increasing involvement by the United States has usually been accompanied by forecasts of early success. It is small wonder that our words have been questioned. Now, at last, our policy is beginning to show signs of forward movement. The Senate debate has pointed up the inadequacy of quick or inexpensive solutions. Emphasis on our willingness to follow a long, hard road is an essential step toward a settlement—so essential that it bears repeating many times.

The Traditional American; Probate Judge Carl E. Wahlstrom of Worcester, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1966

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 27, last, with an appropriate ceremony in the Beth Israel Synagogue Hall at Worcester, Mass., Worcester County Probate Court Judge Carl E. Wahlstrom, became the fourth recipient of the Beth Israel Brotherhood's Good Neighbor Award for his "betterment of understanding among men of all faiths."

Several hundred men and women from the city's major faiths gathered in the congregation's social hall to honor Judge Wahlstrom who was chosen for this particular distinction by a committee made up of the past recipients, A. Alfred Marcello, day city editor of the Worcester Telegram, 1963; Very Rev. Armand H. Desautels, A.A., 1964, then president of Assumption College and now provincial superior of the Assumptionist Fathers in North America; and Rev. Kenneth E. Bath, minister of Greendale People's Community Church, 1965.

A unique silver bowl signifying the Good Neighbor Award was presented to Judge Wahlstrom by Melvin Merten of the brotherhood.

Multitudinous past distinctions have been bestowed upon Judge Wahlstrom in recognition of his most unselfish and effective civic leadership and only last November he was specially honored at a great public testimonial upon the completion of 25 years as probate judge in our area.

He is a graduate of Worcester, Mass., Commerce High School; Clark University in Worcester; and Boston University Law School. Also, he is an acknowledged ex-

pert on Lincoln lore, a director of colleges, businesses and associations, and an honorary 33d degree Scottish Rite Mason.

Mr. Speaker, it was my special pleasure and privilege to sum up the tributes to Judge Wahlstrom that were given by various city officials, educational directors, prominent judges, and spiritual leaders on this occasion.

I emphasized that in the torturous pursuit of solutions for the tremendous problems plaguing ourselves and the world today it is imperative, if we are to be successful, for all of us to perseveringly follow the inspiring example of the life and conduct of Judge Carl E. Wahlstrom so truly representative of the traditional American virtues upon which this country was founded and only upon which it can endure and will prevail.

The text of my summation follows:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE
AT BETH ISRAEL ANNUAL GOOD NEIGHBOR
AWARD TO JUDGE CARL WAHLSTROM, BETH
ISRAEL SYNAGOGUE, FEBRUARY 27, 1966

Rabbi Kazis, other members of the clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of Beth Israel Congregation, it is a particular pleasure for me to take part in this well-deserved public tribute to my dear friend and our good neighbor, Judge Carl E. Wahlstrom.

On the basis of distinguished judicial stewardship alone, Judge Wahlstrom pre-eminently merits the special honor you are conferring upon him this morning.

In his court, the probate court, legal issues and disputes embrace the most intimate actions and vital interests of human beings at their best and at their worst. Their settlement demands the most searching analysis and the most equitable judgment.

To successfully preside over and decide upon these most stirring judicial challenges very truly requires possession of the persistence of Diogenes, the patience of Job, and the wisdom of Solomon; yes, requiring the exercise of the fullest understanding, the deepest compassion, the utmost tolerance, and the kindest firmness.

Judge Wahlstrom possesses these rare qualities and that is why he is an exceptional judge.

Judge Wahlstrom applies these attributes in all his actions and that is why he is an extraordinary person.

Together with his acclaimed leadership in multitudinous community objectives, at great sacrifice, it is the practice of these combined virtues in all his daily associations that makes Judge Wahlstrom our good neighbor.

Perhaps not too many know that he was a student leader and outstanding athlete at Clark University in his college days and served his country as an infantry lieutenant in World War I.

Judge Wahlstrom's career reveals a prime example of the full, wholesome, balanced life.

Besides all this, he is an outstanding scholar and is recognized as one of the Nation's authorities on the life and works of our revered 16th President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln.

It is significantly indicative of the character and disposition of our honored guest that he would be so vitally interested in the life of one of the greatest men of our history whose stalwart qualities and attributes are so well mirrored in his own personal and professional career.

Judge Wahlstrom's distinction in connection with this great American patriot prompts the reflection that perhaps we might suitably and profitably dwell, this morning, on a comparison of the problems that confronted President Lincoln and the country

with the crucial challenges facing us in this nuclear age.

Of course, our problems today are technically different and our challenges are now expanded beyond and above the horizon.

But there is a similar height of urgency in our affairs today. We are at a similar crossroad of our destiny, a destiny involving the world's future.

The various problems bedeviling us today comprise a lengthy and fulsome list. Their broad recitation would include such soul-searching questions as:

How shall we exercise our traditional right to differ while we carry out our patriotic obligation of unity in purpose?

How can we effectuate the guarantees of civil rights while we fulfill our duty of civil obedience?

How shall we apply the restraint of recommended guidelines without suffocating the fruitful energy of personal effort and private enterprise?

How shall we extend our spending while we contain inflation?

How shall we share in the privations of our servicemen fighting overseas while we enjoy the extravagances of domestic plenty?

And finally—How can we negotiate an end of agonizing war without yielding to dishonorable peace terms?

These are a few of what we might term the umbrella challenges.

It would take a hundred mornings and a hundred nights to itemize all the problems that would come under them. And although I receive in my daily mail about 50 earnest and thoughtful suggestions for their settlement, I don't think anyone yet possesses the full answer to each different problem.

It is my opinion the proper answers and full solutions will have to come out of a nationally unified character and atmosphere of moral responsibility, patriotic sacrifice, and dedicated unselfishness that was urged by the voice, and personified in the life and death of Abraham Lincoln.

In this country today we have the great wealth and the highest standard of living of any people in the history of the earth and there is even more in sight on the nuclear energy horizon ahead.

If Lincoln were alive we fear that he would have to question the existence of that moral character and atmosphere in our country today. We fear Lincoln would join with many authorities today who express the deepest doubts that proper solutions to our problems will not be found until substantial turn-about changes are made in a great many current attitudes and practices that seem to be corrupting the core of our modern society.

But, as we look about us today, I think you might agree there are far too many regrettable signs of widespread immorality in conduct, indifference to recognized ethical standards, defiance of legitimate authority, disrespect for hallowed traditions, disregard of our historical ideals, and even some thoughtless ridicule of the heroic sacrifices of our servicemen abroad.

These unhappy signs of dangerous weaknesses in our prosperous society emphasize the wisdom of the warning advice contained in the question President Lincoln asked of the people during a speech in Illinois back in 1858.

This was his question—"What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling sea coasts, our Army, and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors."

It would appear that this question by President Lincoln is even more pertinent to our affairs today than it was back in 1858.

Isn't it the strengths of this traditional belief and American spirit that we must help to place back into the hearts and minds of all Americans and into the basic structure of our national character if we are to find surviving solutions to the problems of ourselves and the world?

A few days ago, as I thought of this meeting this morning, I recalled a story of the father and of the little boy who wanted to be doing something.

The father was stretched out in his easy chair after a day's work to read his newspaper before dinner. He was interrupted by the normal complaint of children about having nothing to do—so he assigned a minor household chore to the youngster.

In no time the boy was back for another assignment. This was repeated several times and finally his father, in desperation, picked up a map of the United States from a table beside his chair, tore it into many dozens of pieces, and said: "Here, son, take this and put the country back together again."

The boy happily went to work on the homemade jigsaw puzzle. His father again settled back with the newspaper—but before he had read as far as the sports page the child tugged at his arm and proudly pointed to a perfectly put together United States of America.

Pleased and amazed by the lad's knowledge of geography and his speed in applying it, the father said: "That's really wonderful. But how did you do it?"

"I remembered," the boy explained, "that on the back side of that map was a picture of a man. And I figured that if I just put man together right, the country would come out in pretty good shape."

Don't you think it is about time for you and for me and for each American to start putting ourselves to right and the country back in good shape?

Isn't it high time for us to get to work to restore proper reverence of our churches, decency in public conduct, ethical standards in business, recognized discipline in educational institutions, obedience to our laws, acceptance of parental authority in the home and a mature, moral example for the proper encouragement of our youth?

And while we proceed with the development of a Great Society let us wisely insure the construction of a good society.

This, I think, was what President Lincoln was urging when, speaking in Milwaukee, on September 30, 1859, he said: "Let us hope that by the best cultivation of the physical world beneath and around us, and the best intellectual and moral world within us, we shall secure an individual, social, and political prosperity, and happiness whose course shall be onward and upward and which, while the earth endures, shall not pass away."

Above all, then, let us remember the true mission of all mankind is not for nations to war with each other unto death but to live with each other in a brotherhood of good will and under a peace of honor forever lasting.

That, I believe, is the true significance and the true meaning of our meeting and ceremony here this morning in this hall, adjacent to your temple of prayer.

That is the true worth of Carl Wahlstrom's contribution of virtues and talents as a good man and a good neighbor.

That, I think, is the true value of your exercise here this morning, in the encouragement of fellow citizens to emulate the example of a good neighbor, for the betterment of their community, for the progress of their country, and for the peace of the world.

If then, we and our fellow Americans will unite in our faiths and consolidate our moral

spirits in patriotic sacrifice to preserve our liberty and repel tyranny I am supremely confident we will not just survive—we will prevail.

Statement on Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today I testified on the subject of "Electoral College Reform" before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

On two occasions, first on February 1, 1965, and again on January 20, 1966, President Johnson urged the Congress to approve a constitutional amendment abolishing the electoral college.

The draft of a proposed electoral reform amendment, which the President sent to the Congress last year, has been introduced in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 53 and in the House of Representatives as House Joint Resolution 278.

The Senate subcommittee began hearings a week ago but, as it happens, I was the first witness to testify in support of the basic approach to electoral college reform as incorporated in the President's proposal.

In most respects, I think this proposal is a sound and realistic one. However, as I pointed out in my prepared statement to the Senate subcommittee, I feel that there is room for improvement.

Since electoral college reform should be a matter of great concern, not only to the Congress but to all Americans, I am including the text of my prepared statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON ELECTORAL COLLEGE, BY BERT BANDSTRA, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM IOWA; SUBMITTED MARCH 7, 1966, TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I am here today to express my conviction that a constitutional amendment is urgently needed to abolish the electoral college and to further modernize our presidential and vice-presidential election process. I am also appearing to place myself on record in support of the basic approach to electoral reform as incorporated in Senate Joint Resolution 53 and, at the same time, to suggest some possible improvements to this proposal.

The electoral college, in my view, is a serious threat to orderly and democratic government. This opinion is based in part on personal experience. Nearly 2 years ago, I served as a presidential elector for my home State of Iowa and, in that capacity, I had the more or less anonymous distinction of being one of the 538 citizens who in 1964 actually cast ballots for the President and Vice President of the United States. Having participated myself in the workings of the electoral college, I can say with some authority that the institution is not only useless but dangerous. I have also given some close study to the way in which the electoral college system has operated in the past, and this has further convinced me that our Constitution today contains serious defects which could at some future date turn a presidential election into a national calamity.

Consequently, I am hopeful that this session of the Congress will approve and send to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment to remove the long-existing flaws in our presidential and vice-presidential election process. My feeling is that such an amendment should be confined to making limited reforms, as is the case with Senate Joint Resolution 53, and that efforts to fundamentally alter the basic operation of our electoral system should, for the time being at least, be put to one side. An amendment aimed at limited reform would, I think, be most beneficial if it were drafted so as to (1) abolish the electoral college and automatically award a State's total electoral vote to the presidential and vice-presidential candidates who carry the State and (2) reduce to the very minimum the chances of a presidential election being thrown into the House of Representatives, as now provided by the Constitution, or into a joint session of the Congress, as proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 58.

The electoral college and the contingent election, as the provision for choosing the President in the House is often called, are the two major defects in the Constitution as it relates to the selection of the Chief Executive. Both these flaws can be removed by an amendment which would in no way endanger our present two-party system, and which would simply give the constitutional seal of approval to our presidential election process as it is expected to operate today. And I firmly believe a limited reform amendment of this sort is critically needed in order to place our constitutional provisions for the presidential election on a secure and democratic footing. Accordingly, last year I introduced such a proposed amendment, House Joint Resolution 327, in the House of Representatives. Since then, in order to make two technical but necessary revisions, I have reintroduced it in the form of House Joint Resolution 819.

This proposal, in agreement with Senate Joint Resolution 58 would make no sweeping changes in our presidential election system. By contrast other approaches to the electoral college problem would make fundamental, and perhaps even revolutionary, changes in our existing election process. These alternative proposals, of which there are basically three, are all aimed at abolishing the general ticket system, under which a State awards all its electoral votes to the presidential and vice-presidential candidates who carry the State.

There is, to begin with, the proposal for the direct popular election of the President, thereby eliminating the electoral college, electoral votes, and States lines as voting factors. This plan has the merit of insuring that the candidate with the most popular votes will automatically become President. It is, in fact, the only proposal that would do so. However, the blunt truth is that this proposal, whatever its virtues, has almost no chance of adoption. Electoral votes, as the Constitution has always provided, are awarded to States on the basis of their representation in both the House and the Senate. Thus, no matter how small a State's population, it is assured of at least three electoral votes. And it is hardly likely that the smaller States would ratify an amendment abolishing a voting system weighted in their favor.

Secondly, there is the district system proposal. Under this, the electoral college would be retained, but with the express requirement that electors credited to a State on the basis of its representation in the House be elected from single-member districts. Another two electors, like U.S. Senators, would be chosen in a statewide vote. One drawback to this proposal is that it would open the door to possible gerrymandering of electoral districts. It would also divide the Nation into 481 separate presi-

March 7, 1966

200 miles out from shore. Besides, it is not just coastal overfishing that threatens the sportsmen. The pelagic fish he most esteems are far-ranging wanderers, and it matters not a whit whether they are destroyed 5 miles out or 500.

Since no practical means of controlling the long-liners has yet been devised, or even proposed, a few frustrated sport fishermen have been taking matters into their own hands. Long-line sets have been destroyed in the Atlantic. Off Acapulco, sport fishermen, persistently wreaking havoc on long-liners off their coast, forced one Japanese vessel to abandon the area as too expensive. U.S. sport-fishing boats sailing off the shores of Baja California play a game called "ocean skeet." They shatter the long-liners' glass buoys with shotguns.

The damage inflicted by such means is, of course, a mere nuisance and will have little or no effect on the enormous enterprise that long-lining has become. But when a Japanese long-liner ran aground last September on the southernmost tip of Baja California gleeful Mexican fishermen indulged in soul-satisfying fantasies to account for the wreck and take credit for it.

The 350-ton vessel crashed onto a reef at about 2 a.m. The 18 men aboard all got ashore safely. Some commercial and sport fishermen went aboard and found the boat equipped with the very latest in navigational and fish-finding equipment, from radar to sonar. Stacked in her freezer locker below decks were an estimated 140 tons of tuna, 40 tons of marlin and an unknown quantity of shark meat, in addition to dolphin, wahoo and sailfish.

How to account for the wreck? The Mexicans wink and tell any of a number of stories:

1. Mexican fishermen turned off the light in the lighthouse. (Ah, but with all that electronic gear a modern vessel does not bother with lighthouses.)

2. They turned off the light and set up another light atop a high cliff to lead the Japanese astray. (But the radar would have indicated the huge land mass—cliffs several hundred feet high on the beach—behind the Judas light.)

3. Long-line sets are equipped with transistorized homing buoys that send out a signal to guide the fishing boat to where the sets have drifted. The Mexicans took one such buoy and put it on the beach. (This one is more ingenious than plausible. The Japanese navigational gear again would have fooled the plot.)

What hope is there, since even the wishful cleverness of Mexican wreckers is no match for the vast Japanese fleet. One theory, not very attractive, is that overfishing will solve itself.

"In some ways long-lining may be considered self-limiting," says Frank J. Mather III, associate scientist at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and himself a sport fisherman. "When the catch declines enough it becomes unprofitable. I think there is cause for concern but don't know what can be done. Agreement among all the nations involved would be very difficult."

"We know the extent of long-lining," Mather says, "but we have no idea of the size of fish populations." Such knowledge would be essential to the establishment of meaningful international controls, but it simply is not there to be laid on the bargaining table.

There is unanimity among marine scientists that research is a sine qua non of international controls.

"We are getting more and more letters from Congressmen inquiring about long-lining," says Albert H. Swartz, assistant chief of the Division of Fishery Research of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. "Some people are advocating an extensive research program. Others are talking about an

international convention—but there are no facts to bring to it. A research program would take about 5 years before we could go to the Japanese regarding conservation measures."

Swartz made a point that sport fishermen and their associations might consider.

"Until now," he said, "international conventions have always been on food fish. The sport fishery has never been represented. Now sport fishing should be represented. The International Game Fishing Association should have a voice."

It should indeed. And so should all sport fishermen, organized or unorganized, who know the names and addresses of their Congressmen, who, in turn, might well be persuaded to initiate preliminary negotiations with the Japanese while a crash research program is underway. The extent of this crisis cannot wait for precise scientific determination. The commonsense evidence is plentiful now. At this juncture the need for controls is clear. In the long run, controls need not deprive the Japanese of their protein supply. They could, in fact, preserve it.

Edward W. Allen recently was chairman of an international meeting which sought, unsuccessfully, to institute new controls on fishing in the North Pacific. Though he spoke in another context, in a statement to the conference he may have suggested the theme for a preliminary meeting of world sport fishing associations and the leading fishing nations. He put it this way:

"Ocean fisheries should not be deemed to exist merely for the benefit of [commercial] fishermen and cannery operators, but should be considered to be a great trust for the benefit of humanity."

UN

Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, a day does not pass but that I receive mail from people in my district who are concerned about the war in Vietnam. By far, most of it expresses firm support for President Johnson and the policies the administration are following in southeast Asia.

A few days ago my mail included a letter from a close personal friend not in my district but in Thailand, where the Government is already faced with the all too familiar tactics of Communist aggression in its northern Provinces.

His letter, a portion of which I have unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record, is illuminating. It is the result of careful observation and evaluation by a man who is living and working in southeast Asia. Along with his letter, he sent a copy of a letter written to the editor of the Bangkok Post by a group of American scholars who are specialists in Asian affairs. It too is an illuminating commentary and I insert it, too, in the Record at this point.

The letters follow:

DEAR DON: It was very good hearing from you. My faith in the American political process is always made stronger by the knowledge that such people as yourself are representing the American public.

I like to think that in a private capacity, I am making a contribution to a better life for a small segment of Asia in a socially stable but progressive context. The work is rewarding—if exhausting—I travel a great deal, particularly to Laos. I am still the "last of the New Deal Democrats" domestically. Don, but I am perturbed that the liberal Democrat is becoming identified with the Lippman-Morganthau-Fulbright position. I feel it is essential to pursue the objective of peaceful negotiations to the best of our ability. I also feel that the ultimate battle for Vietnam will be won by achieving a social revolution that entails such things as land reform, local democracy, community development programming, etc.

At the same time, however, it seems to me absolutely essential to stand fast in military terms while pursuing the other objectives noted above. We must not allow the Communists to feel that their "wars of liberation" subversion and infiltration doctrines will prevail and represent the wave of the future. The Communist goals are outlined plainly and their objectives and methods are stated boldly. They believe their hegemony will hold sway over all Asia and by ideological imperative of their doctrine wars of aggression and infiltration are justified. We cannot abandon Asia to such a doctrine either in our interests or in the interests of the free Asian nations.

The domino theory has an element of truth. The pressures on Laos and consequently on Thailand will be overpowering if the Vietcong and Hanoi and Peiping gain control over South Vietnam through their aggression. There is no doubt the subversion in northeast Thailand is directed by and supported by personnel trained in Communist-controlled areas outside of Thailand. This is clear and certain and if our resolve is weakened and our position compromised in Vietnam, such subversion and infiltration will be increased and the resolve of the Thais and others to combat such subversion will be weakened.

I am enclosing a letter for the editor written to the Bangkok Post by eminent and respected scholars in the field of Asian studies. You may have already seen this letter. I know most of the signatories personally. They have all traveled widely in Asia and have an intimate knowledge of Asia, of Communist objectives, of the Vietnam situation. Their views are sound and well reasoned. I agree with their conclusions. If this statement has not already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—it should.

Please forgive me for rambling on. We who are working in the field are involved and committed to seeing a better world created in Asia. I hope it will be achieved. But it will not be easy.

[From the Bangkok Post, Jan. 29, 1966]

U.S. GROUP SUPPORTS VIETNAM WAR

To the Editor:

We, the undersigned, write as scholars and specialists most of whom have devoted much of their adult lives to study and work in south and east Asian affairs. Included in our number are most of this Nation's small nucleus of specialists on Vietnam. Many of us have lived in Vietnam itself.

We feel compelled to write in response to what we consider the distortions of fact and the emotional allegations of a small but vociferous group of fellow university teachers regarding the war in Vietnam. We must first observe that those who have signed advertisements and petitions represent a very small proportion of all university professors. Further the petition signers include disproportionately fewer schools in the fields of government, international relations, and Asian studies. To our knowledge, no acknowledged expert on Vietnam itself has signed the advertisements appearing in the New York Times protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam. A

mere handful of scholars with Far East credentials identified themselves with these protests.

Quite apart from the merits of American policy—past or present—we believe the manner in which the petition and many “teach-ins” have been presented is a discredit to those who would call themselves scholars. The Vietnamese war and its related political context are enormously complex. Even the most qualified experts disagree on important facts or the meaning of those facts. It is no surprise that they also disagree on alternative courses of action.

It serves no useful purpose, therefore, to engage in name-calling, distortion, emotionalism and gross oversimplification. Many of our fellow scholars, no doubt eminently qualified in their own fields, are in our view guilty of unacademic behaviour in their protests of Vietnam policy.

For the record, therefore, we feel compelled to make the following assertions of fact:

1. The Vietcong initiated the present war in South Vietnam. They did so in gradual stages, beginning with assassination, terror, and bellicose propaganda. This was followed by sabotage, subversion, and small-scale guerrilla attacks; in later stages, large-scale frontal assaults were employed. Only in the last stage did the U.S. Government feel compelled to increase its military involvement substantially.

2. The Vietcong is a Communist-led and Communist-controlled political movement. Its aim is to establish, by any available means, a Communist rule in South Vietnam.

3. It is false to compare the war now being fought in Vietnam with that which was fought by the French between 1946 and 1954. That was a colonial war, fought by Vietnamese of every variety of political complexions to achieve national independence. The Government of Vietnam since 1954 has been a truly Vietnamese national regime, and it is fighting now to maintain its independence. That it is not without faults goes without saying. This, however, is not the issue. Surely, it is of some significance that not one prominent nationalist of all the thousands of such men in South Vietnam has defected to the Communist since 1954.

4. The People's Revolutionary Party, which leads the Vietcong, is a segment of the Lao Dong (Communist) Party of North Vietnam. The Vietcong itself was organized by the North Vietnamese, armed by the North Vietnamese, and trained by the North Vietnamese. This is not to deny the fact that many of its cadres were originally born in South Vietnam, and later trained or indoctrinated in the north. Nor is it to deny that thousands of South Vietnamese were persuaded or forced to join the Vietcong in the south.

5. The Vietcong have employed methods of terror, torture, and outright murder that, on a smaller scale, rival the atrocities of the Axis Powers in World War II. Thousands of innocent people (including women and children) have been deliberately slaughtered by the Vietcong as “examples” for the other South Vietnamese. Beheading and mutilation are not uncommon. For American academics to bemoan the “brutality” of the South Vietnamese response, without the slightest comment on the initiators of the brutality, is the epitome of bias.

6. The Communist regime in North Vietnam is among the harshest and most brutal in Asia. All opposition has been exterminated. The society is organized into cells of mutual surveillance.

No free elections of any kind have been permitted. The living standards of the people are low even by Asian standards.

7. In contrast, the people of South Vietnam, until the stepped-up Vietcong attack,

were enjoying a far better living standard. Hunger was virtually eliminated. Industries were expanding. Schools, clinics, and social welfare services were proliferating rapidly. Between 1954 and 1961, there were four elections, conducted with varying degrees of freedom.

8. The Geneva accords were broken first and repeatedly by the Communists, as documented by the records of the International Controls Commission.

9. The President has offered to hold unconditional peace talks with Hanoi and has been rejected repeatedly by Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow. The burden of proof is now on the Communists.

10. Communist conquest of South Vietnam would, in our view, lead inevitably to a deterioration of resolve throughout south and southeast Asia. While the non-Communist states in the region are not likely to fall in actual geographical sequence (that is, the “domino” theory), we believe these nations would eventually succumb politically and/or militarily to Chinese expansionism following an American withdrawal from Vietnam. We further believe that Chinese hegemony over southeast Asia would be disastrous to American national interest and will severely compromise the capacity of Japan, the Philippines, India, and Pakistan to survive as independent nations.

If there is any lesson that should have been learned by us since 1919, it is that collective security is the only effective means to deal with totalitarianism on the march. Our negotiations and agreements must not be “Munichs.” Rather, they must be backed by clear evidence of our determination to maintain the arrangements agreed to as the conditions for peace. Men who prize liberty are unwilling to settle for peace at any price. Nor does negotiation from weakness and without conditions serve to placate imperial ambitions. The surest guarantee of peace in Asia is what it has always been everywhere: recognition by all that our commitments to our allies will be honored. And we shall use the peace thus secured as Americans used it in postwar Europe, and as President Johnson has pledged to use it for Asia. The basis for a lasting settlement in Asia will be built as we create the conditions for freedom through social and economic programs no less than through military means.

The signers (organizational affiliations listed for identification purposes only):

Dr. Wesley R. Fishel, Michigan State University; Prof. P. J. Honey, University of London; William P. Maddox, New York City; Prof. Ralph L. Turner, Michigan State University.
 Dr. Charles Wolf, Jr., the Rand Corp.; Dr. George E. Taylor, University of Washington; Prof. William B. Dunn, University of the State of New York.
 Prof. John D. Montgomery, Harvard University; Dr. Frank N. Trager, New York University; Rev. Francis J. Corley, S.J., St. Louis University; Dr. Chester L. Hunt, Western Michigan University; Dr. Lucian Pye, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. David A. Wilson, University of California.
 Dr. Anrom H. Katz, the Rand Corp.; Dr. John T. Dorsey, Vanderbilt University; Dr. I. Milton Sacks, Brandeis University; Dr. Charles A. Joiner, Temple University; William Henderson, Socomy Mobil Oil Co.; Dr. Guy H. Fox, Michigan State University; Dr. Ralph H. Smuckler, Michigan State University; George K. Tanham, the Rand Corp.; Dr. Karl J. Selzer, Yale University.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

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

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

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

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

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

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

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

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

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

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