

June 2, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3009

ington as administrative assistant to Senator Daniels.

TO TEXAS WITH GOVERNOR

In 1956 Jacobsen returned to Texas as executive assistant to Governor Daniels, and entered private law practice two years later.

"I like Texas," he says in an accent which testifies to his affection.

"I like the warm, friendly people, and the open spaces—it's uncluttered geographically."

But he explains that he had to come to Washington when the President asked him to do so.

"I feel if you have an ounce of patriotism or sympathy, you can't say 'No' to a President."

Jacobsen, who is experienced in what has been referred to as the bloody battleground of Texas politics, makes a wry comparison with the machinations in the nation's capital.

"Texas politics are tough, but compared to this, it's nothing," he observes.

However, Jacobsen appears to be a man who can make the best of most things. When he moved to Washington as a White House assistant, he promptly made himself comfortable in a second-floor office, contemporary in style, with chairs upholstered in deep purple and orange in contrast to pale beige walls and rugs, and the bittersweet tunes of the Nineteen Forties as background music.

LIKES TO DESIGN COMFORT

"I like to design comfortable surroundings and then work in them," says Jacobsen, who asserts that he is not prone to haunt the President's office, although he is included in the select group which arrives daily in the President's bedroom before breakfast to confer on the day ahead.

Jacobsen reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at home before he leaves for the White House, underlining passages relating to Administration policies or programs, to be drawn to Mr. Johnson's attention.

But after half an hour or so with the President as a beginning to the day, Jacobsen retires to his own office to work on projects suggested by Mr. Johnson, or relating to the previous day's work.

CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON

Congressional liaison is one of Jacobsen's duties, and he spends some time daily chatting with contacts on Capitol Hill.

He describes himself as a "general assignment" man and maintains that he has no wish to become another Valenti.

"Jack is a lovable kind of guy, but I don't think anybody could take his place," he says, adding, "I don't fit the mold."

According to Jacobsen, the most important characteristic for a White House assistant is the ability to use his own judgment and to state facts concisely, whether verbally or in a memorandum.

LONG MEMORANDA TABOO

"The President doesn't like long memoranda—but then, nobody does," he notes.

His attitude toward Mr. Johnson, a man rumored to be both difficult and demanding as an employer, reflects the Jacobsen brand of pragmatism.

"I read all the stories about how hard it was to work for him," he recalls, "and I believed them because I had no reason not to. I have simply found them to be untrue, at least in my case."

"I like his personality," he continues. "It stimulates you to witness the operation of his mind. He makes you think you can do things which you don't think you can do."

NO CONTROL OF YOUR TIME

Jacobsen describes the White House as "like any other public office where you have no control of your time."

"When I ran a law office, I set my own schedule," he points out. "I could tell important clients when I could see them. Here,

the public—or the President—owns your time."

Like other White House aides, Jacobsen is high on the invitation list of status-conscious Washington hostesses. But he says he almost never accepts invitations except from a few friends.

SOUNDS PRETTY GOOD

"A White House assistant sounds pretty good, almost as good as a Cabinet officer," he observes shrewdly.

Leaning back in a purple chair, smoking a long slim cigar, Jacobsen admits that working for the President is demanding, but adds firmly that it is "no more difficult than anything else I have ever done."

Grinning, he drawls, "I'm used to demands. I used to be as poor as a church mouse. I've been demanded of all my life."

U.S. Army Veterinary Corps Celebrates 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 3, the U.S. Army will commemorate the 50th anniversary of the founding of its Veterinary Corps. I take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to the corps on this their 50th anniversary.

Since the inception of the Veterinary Corps of the Army in 1916, veterinary officers have been utilized in the conduct of animal care, food inspection, and support of varied military research programs. The number of veterinary officers assigned to research activities during the first 25 years of the corps' existence were relatively few compared to the number of officers assigned to animal treatment facilities or food inspection activities. These early investigators made many notable contributions to military medicine, not only in the area of animal diseases but also in the prevention of diseases transmitted from animals to human beings.

During World War II the Army utilized over 56,000 horses and mules and several thousand war dogs. With such a large animal population the Army faced many problems related to the health of these animals, which required research programs for their solution.

Much of the research activities of the military veterinarians of World War II was directed to the solution of problems related to the health of human beings rather than animals per se. They collaborated in the development and production of vaccines for the protection of human beings against typhus and Japanese B encephalitis. Antigens were developed for the diagnosis of leptospiral infections of military animals and the use of such antigens were subsequently extended to the diagnosis of this infection in human beings.

Within the modern army the officers of the Veterinary Corps are playing a vital role in military research and development activities. Today, over 22 percent of all army veterinarians on active

duty are assigned to research and development activities. In addition, a small but increasing number of Army veterinary officers are assigned to certain Navy installations to perform research functions. The demand for veterinary officers to be assigned to military research programs exceeds the current availability of such officers. It is to this vital role of today's Veterinary Corps that most of the people may be unaware.

Because his training in medical sciences parallels that of the physician, the Army veterinary officer is qualified to assume certain research functions in addition to those which are strictly veterinary in nature. By virtue of post-doctoral study, and training a sizable number of officers of the Veterinary Corps are now recognized specialists in a variety of disciplines such as pathology, microbiology, radiobiology, toxicology, experimental surgery, and laboratory animal science. The professional talents of such officers are required in military research to provide assistance for all projects involving the development of subsistence items or in which laboratory animals are employed.

Although large numbers of laboratory animals were used for military research in World War II, increasingly larger numbers of such animals have been utilized on an annual basis since that time.

Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, the Surgeon General, the Department of the Army, has, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, congratulated the corps on its many past accomplishments.

I would like to insert General Heaton's congratulations into the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 30, 1966.

To each member of the U.S. Army Veterinary Corps:

I wish to extend my congratulations and sincere appreciation to each member of the Army Veterinary Corps on the occasion of your Fiftieth Anniversary.

The officers of the Corps, a key member of the Army's medical team, reflect on its role in improving health conditions in military and civilian communities around the globe.

In keeping pace with the progress of the last five decades, your Corps can claim its share of "firsts" in improving the well being of American and Allied Armed Forces, as well as pioneering contributions to the world's food supply and human health.

I am certain that the challenge of the future will be met with equal enthusiasm as it has in the past.

Lt. Gen. LEONARD D. HEATON,
The Surgeon General.

U.S. Airmen Chafe at Curbs in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, an article concerning the restrictions on air targets in Vietnam was published in the Plain Dealer at Cleveland recently, and has brought considerable comment from

June 2, 1966

A3010

my constituents. It is a subject of concern to us all, and I ask leave to include the article with my remarks as follows:

BOMBING HANOI ADVOCATED: U.S. AIRMEN CHAFE AT CURBS IN VIET
(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SAIGON.—Senior U.S. Air Force officers here have been disheartened by the restrictions placed on their conduct of the air war over North Viet Nam.

"In my view," one said this week, "we can neither win the war nor bring Ho Chi Minh to the bargaining table unless we change the rules. What we are doing now simply isn't working well enough."

In private conversations, the officers concede that they have been unable to stop the flow of North Vietnamese infiltrators into the South, despite the expenditure of thousands of man-hours and millions of pounds of ordnance.

They maintain that troops, the great majority of them moving on foot, cannot be stopped by bombing the trails over which they move or the areas in which they assemble. The United States has been bombing supply routes in North Viet Nam and in Laos for more than a year but 20,000 North Vietnamese have still managed to make their way South since Jan. 1.

Nor, in the opinion of these same officers, is the Hanoi government likely to sue for peace or seek negotiations unless U.S. air power threatens its survival.

"Those people have had a tough road to hoe for a long, long time now," an officer with wide experience in Southeast Asia said. "We won't terrify them by knocking out their bridges. They just rebuild the bridges and press on."

The use of B52s at Mu Gia Pass has not been successful either, according to informed sources. The pass was reopened, they say, within less than 24 hours after the initial strike, which was heralded by officials as an enormous success that had crippled enemy supply systems.

"In fact," one key Air Force man said, "The B52s are really not very well suited in Viet Nam. They are good for area targets—factories, downtown areas—but we don't get orders to hit those here."

As matters now stand, the Air Force Command here feels that it is compelled to play chess without the power to attack its opponent's queen.

Only by smashing the war-making capacity of the North, the officers argue, can the ability of Hanoi to support a large army in the South be eliminated. Only by doing this, they say, can continuation of the war be made painful enough for the Hanoi regime to force it to seek some way out.

Specifically, many Air Force officers in Viet Nam would like to bomb the military and industrial complex of Hanoi-Haiphong. A few would also like authority to destroy the dams of the Red River, which would cause widespread flooding in the delta areas where most of the North Vietnamese live.

They insist, moreover, that it is folly not to strike the four airfields that ring Hanoi—at Phuoc Yen to the north, Kep to the northeast, Gia Lam to the south and Cat Bi to the east, near Haiphong—at a time when U.S. pilots are encountering Communist MIGs more frequently.

All targets in the North must be approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and, in practice, many of them must be approved by the White House. Currently, U.S. planes are not permitted to strike in the neighborhood of Hanoi or Haiphong, except to bomb anti-aircraft or missile installations.

Key staff members of the 7th Air Force, chafing under these restrictions, also resent what they consider "unethical conduct" by the Department of Defense during the controversy over the shortage of bomb parts

that has plagued operations in South Viet Nam for several weeks.

One source said that he had been told, in effect, to lie to newsmen who asked about the problem.

Investigation teams have been sent to the offices of staff officers suspected of having discussed the shortage with news correspondents.

"I've never seen a war where Washington meddled so much," a colonel said. "They want us to do the job, but they don't want to give us the latitude to do it. I sometimes feel guilty about sending pilots up there knowing that I haven't done all I could to bring them back alive."

Our China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, because of the recent critical events in southeast Asia, Communist China has become a key area of concern to all of us. Because of the significance of an editorial which appeared in the April 20, 1966, issue of Long Island Newsday, I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

OUR CHINA POLICY

"Where there is no vision, the people perish."

—Old Testament: Proverbs XXIX, 18

Secretary of State Rusk, in diplomacy an "old China hand," has submitted to Congress a sane, balanced and impressive statement of U.S. policy toward Communist China. He spoke from a long background of knowledge, for during World War II he served on the staff of Gen. Joseph (Vinegar Joe) Stilwell, commander of the China-Burma-India theater, and in 1950-51 was assistant secretary of state for Far Eastern affairs.

The secretary's testimony was delivered before a closed hearing of the Far East Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee last month, but was not released until last Saturday. It is a paper that serves as further evidence that Rusk is becoming one of our great secretaries of state. It is also a realistic document, and a temperate one. It does not slam the door on Red China as a member of the world community; in fact, it opens that door. If China will give up aggression and its efforts to dominate its neighbors, the U.S. is willing to extend the hand of friendship. But until such time, this country must keep its guard up and its powder dry.

The secretary displayed great erudition in referring to China's past "humiliation of 150 years of economic, cultural and political domination by outside powers." The cession of Hong Kong to Great Britain in 1842, the forced creation of five "treaty ports" open to foreign residents and trade, and a whole series of invasions and civil wars transformed a once great power into a nation fragmented by internecine struggles. The Communists took advantage of more than a century of chaos. In October, 1934, Chiang Kai-shek, as head of government, sought to wipe out the Reds as a military power. This led to the famous "Long March." Ninety thousand Communists under Mao Tse-tung broke through encircling Nationalist troops in the Province of Kiangsi in south central China.

In one year, after the loss of 70,000 troops, the remaining Reds under the leadership of

Mao Tse-tung completed a 6,000-mile march through the mountains and arrived at Shensi Province in northwest China. This outnumbered band, embittered but tough, eventually drove Chiang from the mainland to Formosa and formed a new government Oct. 1, 1949.

OUR RECORD: A GOOD ONE

The embitterment persists, even though there are historic ties of friendship between the people of mainland China and those of the U.S. Secretary Rusk reviewed our record, and it is a good one. We have sought to lessen tension and to normalize relations. Peking has refused every overture, insisting that we must first abandon our support of the Nationalist regime of Formosa. We are not, as the secretary clearly indicates, opposed to China because of its ideology but because it is hostile to the U.S. and has pursued a course of subversion or aggression, in Korea, in India, in Vietnam and in Africa, to mention a few such places. The secretary has listed a 10-point program for dealing with mainland China. He hopes for peace and for an eventual change in the attitude of the new generation of leaders soon to come. He does not want this country to assume that a state of hostility is unending and inevitable. At the same time he feels we "should be under no illusion that by yielding to Peking's bellicose demands today we would in some way ease the path toward peace in Asia."

We do not intend to wage war on China. "We look forward hopefully, and confidently, to a time in the future when the government of mainland China will permit the restoration of the historic ties of friendship between the people of mainland China and ourselves." Conciliation, however, is a two-way street down which the leaders of Red China fear to venture. The secretary, by stating precisely our aims and desire for peace, has done a great service. His position paper is a classic. It is a telling answer to those scholastic "experts" who have argued a policy of surrender rather than steadfastness.

I Am a Tireless American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing and encouraging to see a citizen of the United States express positive patriotic ideals. Mr. Darrell Gifford, a teacher from Garden Grove, Calif., tired of those who are negative in their outlook, decided to express his sincere patriotic feelings for the United States.

The statement entitled, "I Am a Tireless American," is an inspiring statement of principles.

The statement follows:

I AM A TIRELESS AMERICAN

(By Darrell Gifford)

I am a tireless American. I'm undaunted by epithets from tired Americans and other critics of America.

I'm steadfast in the face of criticism from those countries receiving American charity. Their right to criticize surely is no less unalienable than mine. I remember how some of our patriot forefathers criticized France as French funds, French soldiers and the French fleet helped us force Cornwallis to surrender at Yorktown.

June 2, 1966

A3001

Solution in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1966

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a number of Congressmen who are members of the Democratic study group were privileged to meet with Thich—pronounced Tic—Nhat Hanh, a Buddhist monk from South Vietnam. He is the director of the school of social studies at Ban Hanh University in Saigon. As director of the youth for social service program of the Unified Buddhist Church, he trains young people for work in social reconstruction in the villages. Through this and his leadership of the Buddhist Little Peace Corps, he has been in close contact with the peasants—who make up 90 percent of the Vietnamese population.

The Venerable Nhat Hanh is the editor of the leading Buddhist weekly, Thien My—pronounced Tien Me—and director of the Buddhist publishing house in Saigon. A leader among the intellectuals in Vietnam, he is one of the country's best-known poets and the author of 10 published books.

Although he is not here as an official representative of the Buddhist leadership, he is particularly well equipped to talk to us because of his knowledge of both the United States and his own country. He has been an intimate friend of the Venerable Tri Quang for 20 years and it was Tri Quang who cabled him in 1964 to give up his studies and lecturing at Columbia University to return to Vietnam.

He speaks with the familiarity of one who has participated in the center of the decisionmaking group of the Buddhist community. Thich Nhat Hanh released the following statement under date of June 1, 1966. It contains the thoughts of one who is clearly close to his country. It contains suggestions for a solution in Vietnam that parallel ones put forth by enlightened American leaders. In addition, it gives assurance that such solution would have to be accepted by the Vietcong. In this respect it is most noteworthy.

STATEMENT OF THE VENERABLE NHAT HANH,
JUNE 1, 1966

Just this morning the U. S. Consulate in Hue was destroyed by angry Vietnamese youths. In the past four days five Vietnamese have immolated themselves by fire, some of them leaving behind messages explaining that their actions were in protest against U.S. policy in South Vietnam. During my short visit to your country I have been repeatedly asked why the Vietnamese people seem to have become so strongly anti-American.

I wish, first of all, to assure you that I am not anti-American. Indeed, it is precisely because I do have a great respect and admiration for America that I have undertaken this long voyage to your country, a voyage which

ago. What has been happening meanwhile that it is only on the very eve of Medicare that stepped-up efforts are being made to bring a compliance which is required for any federal funds? Why do these efforts reach the acute stage when it could virtually nullify the medical program to which the state's and the nation's elderly citizens have been looking forward and into which they have poured millions of their own dollars?

It has been painfully obvious that Medicare will tax the facilities of every available hospital. A shortage of beds and personnel will undoubtedly prove the program's greatest handicap. Now comes a situation in which civil rights—and this is no attempt to downgrade them—are being put above basic human rights. What is going to happen if Washington bureaucrats have not gotten around to inspecting all hospitals—or refuse to approve many solely because of the Civil Rights Act—by July?

What comes first when sickness, emergency or death threatens—suffering patients or a Washington guideline? The suffering will be there regardless of race; there is no distinction of races in illness.

Beyond that, where is the repeated assurance when Medicare was under debate that there was nothing in the program to hinder or interfere with freedom of choice in physician or hospital?

Washington hasn't heard any howl of protest that will begin to compare with the outcry which will arise if Medicare participants cannot get what is coming to them because of bureaucracy, red-tape and the paramountcy of any other cause over the alleviation of human suffering and the saving of human life. Mind you, we are not talking about any segment of Medicare patients, but all of them and just as emphatically, all the city's, the area's, the state's and the nation's hospitals and medical care facilities.

What is to be held up at the cost of human life?

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News,
June 1, 1966]

"MUST" VERSUS "CAN'T"

A state-wide meeting of hospital administrators and accountants in Durham last week was warned by its keynote speaker that the "Johnson Medicare system" is here and that hospitals, whether they like it or not, must accept it.

The "must" from that angle sounds strange in the ears of hospitals and public alike since they have been hearing in recent days that only 10 of North Carolina's nearly 200 licensed hospitals—and none in Greensboro—have been approved for acceptance of Medicare patients by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The hospitals, their spokesmen have repeatedly stated, are trying to get ready to take Medicare patients when that program becomes effective July 1 but have yet to learn whether they will qualify.

Inspection teams are going the hospital rounds and hope that their task may be completed within the stipulated time. But there is no assurance that such will be the case, or that the inspection will result in approval for a substantial percentage of hospitals.

We agree that hospitals should and "must" accept Medicare patients. But this "must" becomes largely ineffective when it clashes with a Washington "can't." When a human life may be at stake, quibbling is little short of criminal.

The least that can be done, amidst the present confusion, is an extension of a reasonable time in which to make adjustment and meet standards; and meanwhile every

hospital admonished, in humanity's name, to make ready to accept the avalanche of patients which the new program is expected to bring.

We truly hope no death certificate will have to attribute a single fatality to governmental policy.

DEAR MR. KORNEGAY: Thank you very much for your prompt reply of May 24 to my letter of May 20. Another matter has come to my attention about which I hope you can do something. As you already know, Medicare becomes effective five weeks from today. According to recent editorials in the Greensboro papers, so far only about one-third of the general hospitals in North Carolina have been found acceptable to the Federal Government to furnish care and be reimbursed under the Medicare Act.

The delay seems in almost all cases to involve, about compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. I will not belabor the point that any government contractor is, or should be, required to comply with the Civil Rights Act. I disagree with the Act completely and irrevocably and feel that it is absolutely the worst piece of legislation any Congress has ever passed, but this is no longer the issue.

The issue is that government inspectors have thus far obviously placed Civil Rights above human rights of the sick and injured suffering populace. For example, in a recent meeting the director of one eastern North Carolina hospital stated that he had for years insisted on no discrimination either among staff or patients; there were common heating facilities and common patient facilities. When the inspectors from the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission visited this hospital, they made a major point of the fact that the vast majority of non-white patients were utilizing ward facilities.

There were a few in semi-private and private rooms but the majority were in wards. The hospital administrator pointed out, as you and I can both appreciate, that this was a matter of choice on the part of the patients and that most of them simply could not afford higher patient accommodations. Yet, undoubtedly because of this concentration in lower cost accommodations the inspectors have yet to grant approval for this hospital to furnish services under the Medicare Act. They have visited this particular hospital no less than four times—naturally at considerable expense to the taxpayers—and still there has been no approval. The hospital to which I refer is located in Ahoskie.

It is not clear to me just what influence you might be able to exert in matters such as this. I do feel, however, that we are faced with two government programs, both supposedly designed for the welfare of minority groups but which are now actually opposing each other, and in doing so denying the very people they are supposed to benefit the rights granted them by the Congress.

As our spokesman in Washington, I would like you to do anything and everything possible to see that this inequity is corrected, and I would appreciate hearing the results of your action. Time is of the essence if we are to avoid the possibility of a truly needy, sick person being denied adequate medical care and treatment simply because one branch of our sprawling, all encompassing, Federal Government has not yet made up its mind whether the facilities available to him are suitable to the government. The blame for any such inadmissions will have to rest squarely upon our Federal Government which interferes with both the right of choosing medical facilities and extreme need. This could, in certain cases, be the difference between life and death.

May I please have your support and advice.

A3002

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 2, 1966

entails great personal risk for me upon my return to South Vietnam. Yet I assume this risk willingly because I have faith that if the American public can begin to understand something of what the Vietnamese people feel about what is happening in our country, much of the unnecessary tragedy and misery being endured by both our peoples might be eliminated.

The demonstrations, the self-immolations, and the protests which we are witnessing in Vietnam are dramatic reflections of the frustrations which the Vietnamese people feel at being so effectively excluded from participation in the determination of their country's future. 80 years of French domination over Vietnam were ended by a long and bloody struggle, waged and won by the Vietnamese people against overwhelming odds. During the twelve years since independence most Vietnamese have remained without a voice in the nation's destiny, and this at a time when the nation is being subjected to a destructive force far surpassing anything ever before seen in our country. If anti-Americanism seems to be emerging as a focus for some of the recent protests, it is because the Vietnamese people recognize that it is really only the awesome U.S. power which enables the Saigon governments to rule without a popular mandate and to follow policies contrary to the aspirations of the Vietnamese people. This is not the independence for which the Vietnamese people fought so valiantly.

The war in Vietnam today pits brother against brother, the Viet Cong against the supporters of the Saigon government. Both sides claim to represent the Vietnamese people, but in reality neither side does. The most effective Viet Cong propaganda says that the Saigon governments are mere puppets of the U.S., corrupt lackeys of the imperialists.

Every escalation of the war, every new contingent of U.S. troops confirms these charges and wins new recruits to the Viet Cong, for the overwhelming majority of the Vietnamese people now thirst desperately for peace and oppose any further expansion of the war. They see clearly that the present policy of constant escalation only puts peace ever further into the future and merely guarantees an even greater destruction of Vietnamese society. There are now more than 300,000 Americans in my country, most of them knowing and caring little about our customs and practices and many of them involved in destroying Vietnamese people and property.

This creates friction which generously feeds the anti-American propaganda, and the fact that the war kills far more innocent peasants than it does Viet Cong is a tragic reality of life in the Vietnamese countryside. Those who escape death by bombings must often abandon their destroyed villages and seek shelter in refugee camps where life is even more miserable than it was in the villages. In general, these people do not blame the Viet Cong for their plight. It is the men in the planes, who drop death and destruction from the skies, who appear to them to be their enemies. How can they see it otherwise?

The United States chooses to support those elements in Vietnam which appear to be most devoted to the U.S.'s wishes for Vietnam's future. But these elements have never been viewed by the Vietnamese people as their spokesmen. Diem was not, nor were Diem's successors. Thus, it has been the U.S.'s antipathy to popular government in South Vietnam, together with its hope for an ultimate military solution, which has not only contradicted the deepest aspirations of the Vietnamese people, but actually undermined the very objective for which we believe Americans to be fighting in Vietnam.

To us, America's first objective is to have an anti-communist, or at least a non-com-

munist, Vietnam, whereas the Vietnamese people's objective is to have peace. They dislike communism, but they dislike war even more, especially after twenty years of fighting and bitterness which has rotted the very fabric of Vietnamese life. Equally important, we now see clearly that continuance of the war is more likely to spread communism in Vietnam than to contain it.

The new social class of military officers and *commerçants* which has been created as a direct result of the U.S. involvement, a class of sycophants who support the war for crass economic reasons, are not the people to whom Washington should listen if it sincerely wishes to hear the voice of South Vietnam. The Vietnamese people reject with scorn this corrupt and self-seeking class which cares neither for Vietnam nor for the great ideals of America, but thinks only of its own interests.

The opinion is often expressed that there is no alternative to the present U.S. policy in Vietnam, neither on the political nor the military side. The non-communist alternatives to a military dictatorship are said to be too fragmented to offer a stable alternative, and a cease-fire and U.S. withdrawal are considered unfeasible because it is feared that the Viet Cong will take over the country by terror.

The Vietnamese people recognize both of these dangers, but they also recognize the utter futility of the present course and the catastrophic effects which it is having on our society. Furthermore, we do not agree that there is no alternative to a military dictatorship. The force of Vietnamese nationalism is such an alternative. Indeed, this is the sole force which can prevent the complete disintegration of South Vietnam and it is the force around which all Vietnamese can unite. But nationalism cannot attain its effective potential in the present Vietnamese political climate where opposition to the government invites open persecution upon oneself and identification with it discredits one in the eyes of the people.

More than a decade of this atmosphere has served to drive many of the Vietnamese nationalists into the National Liberation Front, and many others of them into an ominous silence. Last year an effort by a prominent group of nationalists to circulate a mild petition requesting peace negotiations between the South Vietnamese government and the N.L.F. was so brutally attacked by the government that we are not likely to hear from them soon again, despite their having attained some 5,000 signers in less than three days time.

Today, the means for nationalist expression rests mainly with the Vietnamese Buddhists, who alone command sufficient popular support to spearhead a protest for popular government. This is not a new role for Vietnamese Buddhism, for in the eyes of the Vietnamese peasants, Buddhism and nationalism are inseparably entwined. The historic accident that made the popularization of Christianity in Vietnam coincident with France's subjection of Vietnam created this image.

The repression of our faith by the French and by President Diem strengthened it. And today, when the Buddhist attempt to give expression to the long pent-up wishes of the submerged and ignored Vietnamese masses is met by the gunfire and tanks of the Vietnamese army, the Vietnamese people, Buddhist and non-Buddhist alike, clearly see whose action reflects our national heritage and whose action betrays this heritage.

Thus, although the Vietnamese people may lose skirmishes because they have no foreign sources of support, the crude victories of the Saigon generals serve merely to weaken their credibility while confirming the Viet Cong's propaganda claim that the government cares nothing about the people. The Buddhist efforts are designed, not to weaken Vietnam's

resistance, but to create a genuine will to resist.

Differences do exist among the Buddhists, the Catholics, and the other sects, but they would not be unsurmountable if there were a climate in Vietnam that encouraged unity. But there are those who see a unified, popular, nationalist movement in Vietnam as a threat to themselves. Such persons help to sow disunity and then use the disunity which they create as a pretext for retaining power. No, we do not accept the evaluation that there is no alternative to the present type of government.

The second argument offered for continuing present U.S. policy is that a cease-fire and U.S. withdrawal would merely leave Vietnam to the communists. This argument we must also reject. The Viet Cong grow stronger because of the mistakes made by Saigon, not because of its communist ideology or its terror. If South Vietnam could achieve a government which was clearly responsive to the basic aspirations of the Vietnamese people and which was truly independent, there would no longer be any basis for popular support for the rebels. Indeed, the rebels would have lost their reason to rebel, and if any guerrilla activity were to continue the Vietnamese people would have the will to resist it for they could identify it as being hostile to Vietnamese nationalism, contrary to the people's longing for peace and reconstruction, and therefore of foreign inspiration.

Since coming to the United States I have been asked repeatedly to outline concrete proposals for ending the strife in Vietnam. Although I am not a politician and cannot therefore suggest every detail of a satisfactory settlement, the general direction which such a solution must take is quite clear to me and to many of the Vietnamese people. It does not involve the U.S. in any negotiations with Hanoi, Peking, or the N.L.F. To the Vietnamese people such talks, if necessary, are the proper province of Vietnamese officials rather than of Washington.

My solution would be along the following lines:

1. A cessation of the bombing, north and south.
2. Limitation of all military operations by U.S. and South Vietnamese forces to defensive actions: in effect, a cease-fire if the Viet Cong respond in kind.
3. A convincing demonstration of the U.S. intention to withdraw its forces from Vietnam over a specified period of months, with withdrawal actually beginning to take place as a sign of sincerity.
4. A clear statement by the U.S. of its desire to help the Vietnamese people to have a government truly responsive to Vietnamese aspirations, and concrete U.S. actions to implement this statement, such as a refusal to support one group in preference to another.
5. A generous effort to help rebuild the destruction which has been wreaked upon Vietnam, such aid to be completely free of ideological and political strings and therefore not viewed as an affront to Vietnamese independence.

Such a program if implemented with sufficient vigor to convince the now understandably sceptical Vietnamese people of its sincerity offers the best hope for uniting them in a constructive effort and for restoring stability to South Vietnam.

The plan is not perfect, for the question remains of how can the U.S. be sure that the South Vietnamese government and the Viet Cong would cooperate in such a venture. Insofar as the South Vietnamese government is concerned, the past statements of Premier Ky have clearly indicated his unwillingness to seek a peaceful end to the war. In fact, it has been the contradiction between the aggressive words of Saigon and the peaceful statements of Washington which has so discredited the so-called U.S.

peace offensive of last winter. The withdrawal of the U.S. support for Ky may thus be a necessary pre-condition for implementation of such a plan.

It is obviously not possible to predict the response of the Viet Cong to such a program but the installation of a popular government in South Vietnam, plus a cease-fire and the beginning of an American withdrawal, would so undercut the Viet Cong's position that it is likely to have no alternative but to cooperate.

Finally, if some may question why I ask the U.S. to take the first step, it is because the U.S. is militarily the strongest nation in the world. No one can accuse it of cowardice if it chooses to seek peace. To be a genuine leader requires moral strength as well as big guns. America's history suggests that she has the potential to provide the world this leadership.

L.B.J. Loan Pool Plan Unwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1966

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Elkhart Truth, Elkhart, Ind., with respect to the loan pool legislation recently passed by the House of Representatives sets forth the views of many thoughtful Americans. It is worth of careful consideration:

L.B.J. LOAN POOL PLAN UNWISE

Its regrettable that the U.S. House of Representatives saw fit Tuesday to pass by 206-190 President Johnson's proposal to form a pool of government-owned loans and sell shares to big investors.

Under this measure, the administration hopes to sell \$4.2 billion worth of shares during the fiscal year starting July 1, and thus cut federal budget spending by that amount.

On final House vote, all 206 in favor were Democrats; against it were 64 Democrats and 126 Republicans. The bill now goes back to the Senate, which has passed a somewhat different version of the measure.

The GOP Policy Committee in the House denounced the measure as "fiscal chicanery" that would disguise the real size of the federal budget deficit, and said that it would start a new system of back-door financing. It was noted that these participation sales would not count as part of the official, legal ceiling on the federal debt.

Usual political groupings really have been scrambled on this issue.

Fiscally-conservative southern Democrats have backed LBJ. But such liberal groups as Americans for Democratic Action, AFL-CIO and National Farmers Union have sided with the GOP.

The labor organization said the proposal would increase interest rates and would tighten money in the home mortgage market.

AFL-CIO sources also agreed with GOP critics that it stemmed from a desire to keep the projected budget deficit for the year starting July 1—now estimated at \$1.8 billion—as low as possible.

Under the plan, Congress would have to approve funds to make up the difference between the lower interest rates on government-owned loans and the higher interest rates paid on shares in the pool to make them attractive to investors.

The House would not approve an amendment offered by Rep. PAUL FINO (R-N.Y.) to

encourage small-denomination sales to individuals, as he asked "why not let the little cat share in this windfall?"

This is not good legislation. Congress will be in error to pass it.

Secret United States-China Air War in Viet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I have permission to insert in the RECORD the following article from the Chicago's American of May 27, 1966, by Stan Carter, which raises new questions concerning the conflict in southeast Asia: SECRET UNITED STATES-CHINA AIR WAR IN VIET

(By Stan Carter)

WASHINGTON.—Americans and Chinese Communists have been shooting at each other—and keeping quiet about it—in North Viet Nam.

The secret battle is being waged between United States planes and Chinese anti-aircraft guns.

Informed sources also said that a Red Chinese MIG-17 that Peking charged was shot down by American planes apparently did fall in Red Chinese territory.

DENY SHOOTING OVER CHINA

Despite a television report to the contrary, however, the state department stuck by a denial that the American planes that shot down the Chinese MIG on May 12 crossed the North Vietnamese-Chinese border.

There also is reason to believe Russian "advisers" have been killed in United States air strikes against surface-to-air missile sites in North Viet Nam and that the Kremlin has accepted the losses without protest.

The shooting down of the Chinese MIG 2 weeks ago is the only recent direct clash that has been publicized by either side.

DOWNED NORTH VIET PLANE

A United States air force spokesman in Saigon said planes shot down a MIG over North Viet Nam the same day, at about the same time, and thought that it was North Vietnamese instead of Chinese.

Peking produced photos of the MIG's wreckage and a fuel tank jettisoned from an American plane that, it claimed, were found in China. The Red Chinese declared that the "blood debt" owed to the United States would be repaid.

On a news show last night, CBS state department correspondent Marvin Kalb said he had learned that a flight of four United States fighter planes had, in fact, crossed the border and shot down the Chinese MIG as Peking claimed. He said the American planes returned safely.

WHICH SIDE OF BORDER

Other sources told the news that American officials still aren't sure whether the American planes were on the North Vietnamese or Chinese side of the border at the time of the shooting. They said there was little doubt it was a Chinese MIG that was downed, however, and that it fell in China.

Sources said that, except for the propaganda Peking is making about the MIG, the point is academic. They said both sides know they are shooting at each other regularly and aren't talking about it to avoid open confrontation.

The Rhode Island Jaycees and Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech:

THE RHODE ISLAND JAYCEES AND MENTAL HEALTH

(By Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, Gloucester Junior Chamber of Commerce, Harmony, R.I., Nov. 20, 1965)

It is always a pleasure to be back in Harmony, and I am happy indeed to be here for this charter night banquet. As most of you know, I grew up on a farm just outside Harmony and I have a special feeling for these mill towns; these woods; these lakes and ponds.

This is the first opportunity I have had to speak before a Junior Chamber of Commerce group. I especially welcome it, because I am afraid that too many of our fellow citizens have a mistaken notion about the Jaycees. I think too many of our fellow citizens identify you with Junior Miss Pageants and golf and tennis tournaments and other light, social activities. Now, there is nothing wrong with any of those activities—but the Jaycees have a more serious side, which has yet to receive the recognition it justly deserves.

What people fail to realize is that in the 45 years since the first Junior Chamber of Commerce was founded, the Jaycees have made an enormous and continuing contribution to community betterment all across this Nation.

The Jaycees say that their primary purpose is to promote the welfare of the community by supporting active, constructive projects. The Jaycees say they provide the young men of this Nation's communities with training in leadership and awaken civic consciousness to better the usefulness of this country's citizens. These are not empty platitudes.

Because of our common interests in one health area—and tonight I will speak about it, and not about other Jaycee activities, such as physical fitness and environmental pollution, simply because there is not time to discuss all these things—I want to salute the Jaycees of Rhode Island for their activities in support of mental health.

There is no more vital area—no more pressing need—in the health field than mental health. Our citizens must be made aware of the fact that some 86,000 persons in Rhode Island need psychiatric care. Even more important is the need for an awareness among us that last year only 32,000 of these more than 86,000 persons needing help were treated, in Rhode Island. We need to keep before us the obligation to provide more and better services, fast, to care for these people.

I am proud that we Rhode Islanders have one of the oldest mental health associations in the United States. Last Spring I had the pleasure of addressing the New England States Citizens Action Conference on Mental Health in Providence, where I had an opportunity to pay tribute to the Rhode Island Association for Mental Health as it began its fiftieth year of service to the people of this State.

At that time I pointed out that for a number of years now I have watched the community mental health movement prosper and grow. I have had a front-row seat when budget proposals for Federal expenditures in the health field came before my subcommittee for review. During 18 years of service

on the House Appropriations Subcommittee I have also become aware of many pressing needs which have still not been met, and which must be met before we will have fulfilled our obligation to the mentally ill.

I am proud that the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce—through its various chapters—joined in this collective effort to meet these pressing needs. It did not stand idly by, waiting for the Association for Mental Health and related groups—working with the Federal government—to do the job. It joined forces with us in the best tradition of Rhode Island—and New England—cooperating to achieve social goals desired by all our citizens.

The South County chapter of the Jaycees has built a center for mental health rehabilitation. The Charleho chapter, located—as all of you may know—in a rural farm district, has cleared the land donated by a private citizen and is now in the process of laying the foundation for a rehabilitation facility to be called "Camp Hope."

The Barrington chapter has sponsored fund drives resulting in a considerable amount of financial support. And the chapter in Providence is working with Father Robert Blair at the State Mental Hospital on the problem of the rehabilitation of institutionalized persons.

Further, the State Chairman for Mental Health and Retardation—Mr. William Marsland—has organized a series of orientation meetings to acquaint local Jaycee chapters on problems and projects in the mental health area.

This, of course, is Gloucester Chapter Charter Night—the occasion being—I believe—the extension of charter to Gloucester by the Burrillville chapter of the Jaycees. This is a special occasion—a social occasion—a time for celebration—but it is also a time for stock taking—for asking yourselves what projects you will undertake, as a chapter of the Jaycees.

I can think of no single area where citizen action has greater opportunity for rich rewards—no area of health which is more challenging—than the mental health field. The passage of the historic mental health and mental retardation legislation in 1963 by the Congress marked the beginning of a new era—but that era is slow in coming to birth. Citizen action is more important than ever before—and I want to tell you why.

I am proud to have participated in the activities of the 88th Congress which led to the passage of the Mental Retardation and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963. As part of this package the Congress approved funds for the construction of community centers for the care and treatment of mentally ill and retarded persons. However, at that time funds for staffing the centers were dropped from the bill. This year the 89th Congress approved \$73.5 million over 3 years for initial grants, and additional sums for continuing grants. This year, too—and a year late—funds were also provided to meet initial staffing costs of technical and professional personnel in community mental health centers.

We estimate that the centers will receive more than \$225 million over the next 7 years for staffing assistance. More than \$100 million over the next 3 years will be available to train teachers of mentally retarded and handicapped children.

What I have said with these statistics is that the Congress has enacted laws that—if properly implemented—can do much to assist the mentally ill and retarded—and their families—all across this Nation.

Let me repeat the words—"if properly implemented." This is an important and urgent point, and one that I made just a couple of weeks ago before the Rhode Island Chapter of the Council for Exceptional Chil-

dren at the Ladd School in Exeter. It is a matter of great concern to me.

If Federal programs of assistance are to be used effectively in any State, there must be elaborate planning at the State level. We cannot do it from Washington. Here in Rhode Island, such groups as yours—working with the State Mental Health Association—can do much to clear up questions of priorities and needs in localities within the State. The 1963 legislation specifically called for citizen participation in mental health planning, and while the Mental Health Association has the main burden of this charge, the assistance you can provide—as young people with plenty of know-how at the local level—should be an invaluable resource for the Association to draw upon.

Those in positions of leadership must not be allowed to forget the availability of Federal support and the intense need for rapidly getting under way a meaningful program to ease the burden of mental ill-health on the community. New hope for the retarded and for their families is within Rhode Islanders' grasp. We Rhode Islanders must not delay in using every means to equip and assist those who are mentally ill to assume a productive role in society.

Legislation enacted before 1965 authorized Federal funds for State planning to supply better services to the mentally ill and mentally retarded. It also provided funds to aid in the construction of facilities to care for exceptional children and provided a means of giving teacher training for special education. It is my sincere hope that Rhode Island's State officials will soon act to take full advantage of these financial aid programs.

In the problem of financing, you here tonight can help raise matching funds from foundations, other civic groups, State and local funds, and other sources. When funds are short, it may be necessary to support new legislation to finance mental health programs. The times have changed, and so the traditional role of supporting mental health legislation must broaden to include support of the financial means for these programs.

In this connection I cannot refrain from quoting a recent editorial in the Providence Journal, which pointed out that Governor Chafee's administration can get by without new taxes, but at the sacrifice of falling short of the expectations of a modern and progressive society. The editorial was called "Adequate Government Cannot be Cheap," and I hope that all of you—and the Governor—read it carefully.

Of course money is not the sole solution to this complex problem of bringing the best possible health services to all of our citizens.

At the President's recent White House Conference on Health, called to deal with the most pressing health needs of the Nation, the opening discussions of the conference centered on health manpower. For health manpower—or the lack of it—is going to shape and limit the health care we can provide and the health protection that we can offer the American people in the years ahead.

You do not have to be psychiatrists to make a worthwhile contribution here. You can, for example, help see to it that the people in your communities know of and use available facilities, and you may be able to help recruit mental health manpower.

There is another thing that you can do for Rhode Island. Most—or at least many—of you young people are parents. Now, we need to develop our psychiatric services for children, and launch new programs of primary prevention along the lines being followed by the Department of Social Welfare and the Newport School Department—this is a pilot project involving evaluation of children showing problems in adjustment in kindergarten through the third grade.

You, as parents, are in constant contact with the children of Gloucester. By virtue

of this contact you will be able to identify children in your community who have developing emotional problems. You can work through your Parent-Teachers Association to seek out and put into practice programs designed to prevent these emotional difficulties before they occur.

Many such programs, attempted in various school systems, have met with good success. Often a crisis may arise when a child does poorly in school because of language difficulties. The employment of a speech therapist by the school system to work on speech difficulties has forestalled many problems and improved school achievement. Conferences scheduled with frequency between the teacher and parents to discuss the child's academic progress and general adjustment have been helpful in coordinating the efforts of parents and teachers, and in alerting teachers to possible stress situations in the home—such as the birth of a new brother or sister.

Other schools have found that visits by the school nurse to the home of children who are frequently ill, often give school officials insight into problems the child might be facing in the home that produce emotional stress.

Various orientation meetings for new parents, open-door policies on the part of principals to parents, and group discussion between parents, teachers, psychologists and mental health workers, are all helpful in eliminating the causes of emotional problems in children.

Today, of the more than half a million mentally ill patients in institutions in the United States, the numbers of patients in the 10-to-24 age group is increasing rapidly, in contrast to the number of patients in all other age groups. It is estimated that there are in America a total of some four million emotionally disturbed children.

Because one fourth of all Americans are in our Nations' classrooms and because there is a fundamental relationship between intellectual and emotional development, the schools—through strengthened mental health programs—are our best hope for reversing the waste of a considerable part of our youth.

There is at this time no health area that is crying so loudly for the attention of our citizens. Not only is the challenge of helping the next generation open to all—the mentally ill and the mentally retarded of all age groups are waiting for assistance.

This assistance is—in part, at least—being hampered by lack of forceful efforts on the part of the more fortunate of our citizens—such as those of you here tonight.

This we can—and must—do something about. In the tradition of New England—and, of course, of Rhode Island—we must assist our less fortunate neighbors who have been struck by mental disease, just as our ancestors assisted their neighbors when they were victims of Indian attack.

If we fight this fight and win it, the day will come when—just as the Indian names are preserved (on our maps)—the names of the kinds of mental illness will be preserved in books for the curious to read—and will hold no terror for anyone, anymore.

Campus Protests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will find in-

June 2, 1966

effort to satisfy the problems raised at our hearings. It does, and I think effectively, provide for regulation of those marketing practices which the hearings demonstrated to need most urgent attention: relative size designations—small, medium, and large comparisons—the size and number of servings contained in some food packages, the "economy size" designation when in some instances savings may be negligible or even nonexistent.

Subsection (c) also permits regulation of the "cents off" promotion practice with which the witnesses as well as members of the committee seem to have had a great amount of difficulty.

Had the substantive bill stopped there, it would have been a highly commendable piece of legislation. It would have served the needs of the consuming public as evidenced by the hearings. It would have been a bill of which our committee could have been quite proud.

Subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) of section 5 contain the matter which causes my differences with the majority of the committee to be very real and pronounced. Simply stated, these sections provide for standardization of packaging throughout the American marketing system. It is obviously of no significance to deny this import of the bill by saying that the words "package size" do not appear in the power granted under these subsections. The promulgating authority does, under these sections, possess the power to standardize and control the number of types of packages which may be used by the manufacturer and distributor. And, this power is his all to no good purpose, for the entire effort to regulate package sizes can immediately be nullified when those exempt from this act exercise their perfectly proper pricing functions.

Those subsections might possess some redeeming factor if they would accomplish any legitimate purpose at all. Of course, they will provide jobs for a certain few. So do many other Federal programs. But, in light of the policy statement in this bill and the reasons for the legislation, job creation is not a legitimate exercise of the legislative process in this instance.

I can think of nothing less imaginative or more dull than the results of the close regimentation of commercial packaging as these sections of S. 985 contemplate. I hold no particular brief for the esthetic qualities of packages of dry cereal or soap powder.

At the same time, I do not look forward to the day when Washington decides, however, sincerely, that my wife and I can buy potato chips only in a bag big enough for a family of 10 healthy children simply because there were prior to that decision, too many sizes available on the market.

This, indeed, is precisely the reason offered in defense of these subsections of section 5 of the bill—too many different sizes of bags of potato chips. The very best that can be said about these subsections is that they are frivolous. The very least that can be said in their favor is that they represent the continuous thread in Great Society legislation: That

each bill must contain proliferation of jobs and agencies and power or it is not worth reporting for floor action.

Mr. President, the most unfortunate aspect of this legislation is the certain contribution which these provisions in section 5 of the bill will make to the destruction of competition in the American marketplace. The ultimate victim of a lessening of competition will not be American industry or American commerce. Indeed, it will be the consumer who will suffer from regimentation of our commerce.

These parts of section 5 contribute significantly to a recognizable pattern of control of the marketplace.

They should not be permitted to remain in this bill.

GULF OF TONKIN RESOLUTION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I should like a few moments this afternoon to address myself to a subject which concerns the credibility of the administration and the administration's spokesmen on the question of the war in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that materials relevant to the subject to which I shall allude be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. These include a copy of Public Law 88-408, the text of a press briefing by Defense Secretary McNamara dated August 5, 1964, and the text of the Defense Secretary's news conference of the same date.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, without opening a discussion into the legality of the American involvement in Vietnam, it can be stated that the so-called Gulf of Tonkin resolution (H.J. Res. 1145) signed into law by the President on August 10, 1964, is an important element of our position there.

As will be recalled, this resolution was introduced, considered in committee, and passed by the Senate and the House with the greatest of speed during the last presidential election year, and its tenets have been invoked countless times in the continuing discussion of the war in southeast Asia.

As is equally self-evident, the resolution is predicated upon the premise that there were unprovoked attacks upon American ships on the high seas on August 2 and 4, 1964. Repeated statements have been made by numerous administration spokesmen to the effect that these attacks were, in fact, unprovoked and occurred somewhere between 15 and 60 miles from North Vietnamese territorial waters and were a "serious threat to international peace."

I was surprised to read in the transcript of the May 9 hearings before Senator Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee, during which Secretary of State Rusk was under questioning, that there is apparently some question in the mind of the chairman as to the validity of these major premises.

According to the transcript, which is borne out by a tape recording I have of the proceedings, the junior Senator from

Arkansas said, after recounting briefly the history of the Tonkin Gulf resolution, that since the hearings on the resolution, "there has come to my attention suggestions that the whole affair was very questionable as to the character of the attack upon our ships on the high seas."

The Senator then went on to deliver what I would construe to be an assertion that the resolution was intended "to inflame everybody" in the middle of a campaign for the Presidency.

Senator Fulbright continued in his delivery by alluding to the "allegation" by the administration that "this was a deliberate and unprovoked attack on our ships upon the high seas."

So that there will be no question of the context in this matter, I read now from pages 923 and 924 of a committee print of the hearings. Senator Fulbright is speaking:

The whole thrust, I think you will admit, of the Tonkin Gulf resolution was there had been an attack on the high seas on our ships, and the language you insist now as being of great significance was more or less like a whereas to any other resolution. It was a statement of general principles. It was not than considered, I do not believe by anyone, and it certainly was not for me, and I have already publicly apologized for my negligence in not having much more thorough hearings on that resolution, because since that time there has come to my attention suggestions that the whole affair was very questionable as to the character of the attack upon our ships on the high seas.

It is very easy to inflame anybody, particularly in the middle of a campaign for a Presidential election by stating that there has been an attack on the high seas on one of our ships. That was the whole purpose of that resolution. Certainly everyone agrees we ought to repel an unprovoked, deliberate attack upon our ships on the high seas where they had a right to be.

Any suggestion at the time that this might have been a deliberate provocation on our part to invite the incident or that we had been inside the territorial waters of North Vietnam in connection with some boats of South Vietnam, and all of that was brushed aside in the emotions that naturally arose from an allegation by the Administration that this was a deliberate and unprovoked attack upon our ships upon the high seas, and I think you have to admit that was the main thrust.

Now, Mr. President, in my view, this is a most serious matter because the chairman of one of the Senate's most powerful and influential committees, a committee which is playing a great role in shaping public opinion in regard to the war in Vietnam, would seem to have suggested that there was chicanery on the part of the Democratic administration during an election year and in regard to a matter of the gravest international import.

I have taken the liberty of reading some of the past Senate debate on these matters and I would like at this point to read into the Record a brief chronology of events.

Mr. President, as I have said, the attacks upon our ships occurred on the 2d and the 4th of August 1964. Upon that point there is not dispute. On the 4th of August, the President went on national television during prime time to

announce that "renewed hostile actions against U.S. ships on the high seas in the Gulf of Tonkin have today required me to order the military forces of the United States to take action in reply."

At about midnight that night, Secretary McNamara held a press conference in which he announced that "our destroyers have undergone two deliberate attacks in international waters."

That same day at a press briefing, Secretary McNamara again asserted that "North Vietnamese surface vessels attacked U.S. destroyers operating on routine patrol in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin."

On August 5 the President requested the resolution on which hearings were held in executive session the following day.

On that day, August 6, the measure was reported out by the joint Senate committee. It passed the Senate 82-8 on August 7, on which date it also passed the House. It was signed into law on August 10 to become Public Law 88-408.

The resolution says, in part:

Naval units of the communist regime in Vietnam... have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters.

A report submitted by the junior Senator from Arkansas to accompany Senate Joint Resolution 189—the Senate version of the resolution—referred to the unprovoked attacks by North Vietnam on United States forces in international waters.

The Senator from Arkansas, in Senate debate on this resolution August 6, defended the American response to the attacks and the points of fact in regard to them in a forceful and eloquent manner. He told the Senate that he recommended "the prompt and overwhelming endorsement of the resolution now before the Senate"—the Tonkin Gulf resolution—and he went on to assert that "the facts on the immediate situation are clear."

In recounting the attacks of August 2 and 4, the Senator noted that both attacks occurred without provocation and that they occurred in international waters. He went on to say that "the action taken by the United States was appropriate as policy as well as justifiable in law."

But later, doubt enters the record.

During Senate debate on March 1 of this year in the context of discussions of the supplementary military and procurement authorization, the junior Senator from Arkansas is quoted, on page 4201, as saying in regard to the Tonkin Gulf incident:

We were told it was an unprovoked attack. In other words, we had not done anything which could properly be considered as provocation.... I had no reason to doubt the factual situation.

Further on in that debate, on page 4207, Senator MORSE is quoted as saying:

I judge from the way the Senator from Arkansas has expressed himself that he is not too sure just exactly what happened at Tonkin Bay.

In any event, Mr. President, it is, in my view, a most serious business when doubt is cast upon the basic facts of an

international incident which triggered a Senate resolution giving the President of the United States carte blanche authority in dealing with a war situation.

If I have read correctly the comments of the Senator from Arkansas, sometime prior to the hearings of May 9, the Senator has come into possession of what he considers to be evidence that events in the Gulf of Tonkin did not occur quite as the administration has stated.

Let me stress here that I do not know from firsthand knowledge precisely what happened at the Gulf of Tonkin, but official reports and statements, which are, to the best of my knowledge, the only credible account of the events, suggest that our ships were attacked in international waters. The question of provocation would, I suppose, depend upon who is on the receiving end, but I have neither seen nor heard—and I have been a party to briefings by the Secretaries of State and Defense on this matter at the White House—any evidence which would obviate the commonly held premise that our ships were attacked in international waters without provocation.

Let me make crystal clear at this point that on the basis of my past experience with the administration, I am certainly not wedded to the idea that everything the administration says is to be accepted at face value. Although I am inclined to accept the White House version of Tonkin Gulf, I will certainly acknowledge that utter candor is not a hallmark of this administration.

On the basis of the Senator's statement of May 9 and the already well-known position of the administration, it would seem that there is a fundamental conflict of views. This conflict is in the facts of an international incident from which came an extremely important document that is the basis for many of the administration's prerogatives in Vietnam.

If the Senator from Arkansas has unearthed evidence or has found a body of fact contrary to the official version of the Tonkin Gulf attacks, then this is a matter which is extremely important to a nation which is struggling to fully comprehend the history, the implications, and the extent of our commitment in Vietnam.

In all respect to the Senator's high position as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I call upon him to explain fully the nature of his statement during the hearings of May 9. If the Senator has or can acquire the evidence to substantiate his statement, then it would, in my judgment, be in the national interest to fully pursue this matter with hearings, investigations, or public disclosures so that light can be cast into an area in which darkness may now prevail.

Mr. President, as I was preparing to speak I received a letter from the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in which he tells me the subject was examined in detail with representatives of the Department of Defense in executive session on May 24, 1966, and "I would be delighted to have you examine the transcript of that meeting." I shall examine that record and I shall ask

that the relevant portions of it be made public in answer to the questions I have raised.

EXHIBIT 1

H. J. RES. 1145

[Public Law 88-408, 88th Cong. Aug. 10, 1964]
Joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia

Whereas naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace; and

Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom; and

Whereas the United States is assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military or political ambitions in that area, but desires only that these peoples should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way: Now, therefore, be it.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Approved August 10, 1964.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

House Report No. 1708 (Committee on Foreign Affairs).

Senate Report No. 1329 accompanying S.J. Res. 189 (Committee on Foreign Relations). CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110 (1964): August 6: Considered in Senate.

August 7: Considered and passed Senate, in lieu of S.J. Res. 189.

August 7: Considered and passed House.

NEWS CONFERENCE OF HON. ROBERT S. McNAMARA, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, THE PENTAGON, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1964

Secretary McNAMARA. Earlier tonight the President told the nation the United States would take appropriate action to respond to the unprovoked attacks on U.S. naval vessels by torpedo boats of North Vietnam. I can tell you that some of that action has already taken place. U.S. naval aircraft from the carriers *Ticonderoga* and *Constellation*, these carriers operating in the Gulf of Tonkin where our destroyers had undergone two deliberate attacks in international waters, have already conducted air strikes

June 2, 1966

against the North Vietnamese bases from which these PT boats have operated. Our naval aircraft have also conducted strikes against certain other targets which have directly supported the operation of the PT boats. Furthermore, in view of the unprovoked attacks the deliberate attacks in international waters on U.S. naval forces, the United States has taken the precaution of moving substantial military reinforcements to Southeast Asia from our Pacific bases.

In addition we are also sending reinforcements to the Western Pacific from bases in the United States. I think you can understand it is not wise at the present time for me to identify these forces or to list the detailed strength of these movements, but I can assure you that the movements are appropriate to the provocation.

Now I would like to review briefly in chronological order of the unprovoked attacks which took place today, August 4th, on our vessels operating in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin.

You will recall that the destroyer *Maddox* operating in those waters on Sunday, was attacked by three PT boats. The President instructed us to add the destroyer *Turner Joy* to the patrol being carried out by the *Maddox*, and since that time the two vessels have operated on patrol in those waters. You'll see their course on this map.

Here is the southern portion of China, the coast of North Vietnam, down to the 17th parallel, below which, of course, is South Vietnam. This is Hainan Island, possessed by Communist China. The course of our destroyers is here, operating 30, 40 to 60 miles off the coast of North Vietnam in international water, moving southward.

At 7:40 P.M., August 4th, 7:40 P.M. local time, Vietnamese time, August 4th, the *Maddox* at about this position (indicating) reported radar contact with unidentified surface vessels who were paralleling its course, paralleling the track of both the *Turner Joy* and the *Maddox*.

At 8:36 P.M., by which time it was about in this position (indicating), the *Maddox* established two new radar contacts with two unidentified surface vessels and three unidentified aircraft. At this time U.S. fighter aircraft were launched from the carrier *Ticonderoga*, which was also operating in the Gulf of Tonkin. These fighter aircraft were launched to rendezvous with the *Maddox* and *Turner Joy*, and provide air cover to them.

At 9:08, by which time the *Maddox* and *Joy* had advanced south to approximately this point (indicating), the unidentified aircraft had disappeared from the destroyers' radar screens and the surface vessels were remaining at a distance. By that time, the aircraft from the USS *Ticonderoga* had arrived over the destroyers and they commenced defensive patrol over them.

By 9:30, the destroyers were at this point (indicating) and at this time the initial attack occurred. Additional vessels had by now appeared on the *Maddox*'s radar screen, and these vessels were observed to close very rapidly on the destroyers at speeds in excess of 40 knots. The attacking surface vessels continued to close rapidly from both the west and the south.

By 9:52, the *Maddox* and the *Turner Joy* had continued south to approximately this point (indicating), and they reported they were under continuous torpedo attack and were engaged in defensive counterfire.

By 10:15 they had advanced approximately to here (indicating). They were reporting they were avoiding torpedoes and that they had sunk one of the attacking patrol craft.

At 10:42, the destroyers reported they had evaded additional torpedoes and had sunk a second of the attacking patrol craft. Other aircraft from the *Ticonderoga* had ar-

rived overhead and joined the defensive patrol.

At 10:52 the *Maddox* reported the destroyers were again under attack. At midnight, by which time the vessels were in this position (indicating), the destroyers reported they had suffered no hits, no casualties, and that the defense aircraft from the *Ticonderoga* were illuminating the area and attacking the enemy surface craft.

At 12:32, at which time they were at this point (indicating) the patrol reported that an additional enemy craft was believed to have been sunk, and that low ceilings, poor weather, was beginning to hamper the aircraft operations.

At 12:54, the *Turner Joy*, one of the two destroyers, reported that during the engagement, in addition to the torpedo attacks, the destroyer had been fired upon by automatic weapons while being illuminated by search lights.

At 1:30 a.m., by which time the destroyers were in this position (indicating) they reported the attacking craft had apparently broken off the engagement. The *Maddox* and *Turner Joy* were directed to resume their normal and routine patrol operations, and they are continuing them at the present time.

Now, I will endeavor to answer your questions.

Question. Sir, was there anything else ever seen or heard from the unidentified aircraft?

Secretary McNAMARA. No. The unidentified aircraft did not participate in the attack and at this moment, we have no further information regarding them.

Question. In which direction did they disappear?

Secretary McNAMARA. I can't tell you. There was no further information on them.

Question. Can you name the bases in North Viet Nam that were attacked?

Secretary McNAMARA. No. I cannot.

Question. Will you name them before the Communists do?

Secretary McNAMARA. We will name them at a time appropriate to the safety of our forces. It would be inappropriate to name them at this time. The attack is continuing at present.

Question. Can you tell us how many bases?

Secretary McNAMARA. No. Until such time as the attack is completed, it would be unwise to comment further or to identify the areas being attacked.

Question. Can you tell us if the attack is currently underway?

Secretary McNAMARA. It is currently underway.

Question. You made a distinction between North Viet Nam and certain other support facilities?

Secretary McNAMARA. I simply wanted to distinguish between patrol craft bases themselves and certain supporting installations which might be separated geographically from the mooring points of the craft but in North Viet Nam.

Question. There is no question that we attacked any other place but North Viet Nam?

Secretary McNAMARA. None whatsoever.

Question. Can you say if we are attacking Hanoi?

Secretary McNAMARA. We are not attacking Hanoi. We are attacking only the patrol craft bases and certain associated logistical facilities.

Question. In that area?

Secretary McNAMARA. Not in the area of Hanoi. But in North Viet Nam.

Question. The same area as the patrol craft?

Secretary McNAMARA. In the same area as the patrol craft are moored but separated physically from the mooring point.

Question. Mr. Secretary, can you tell us

when the attack has been completed, what orders the entire group has in this area?

Secretary McNAMARA. We will only be able to tell you such information as will not reveal future plans or in any way jeopardize our future operations.

Question. What I mean is, will they go back to the standing orders which they had?

Secretary McNAMARA. It will depend on circumstances at the time.

Question. Mr. Secretary, has the alert status of the United States forces around the world been increased?

Secretary McNAMARA. Only such units are being alerted for reinforcing moves.

Question. Has there been any long range alerts to any portion of defense industrial base at all?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, none.

Question. Sir, were all the attacks from the two carriers?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes. The only aircraft participating in the strikes are aircraft from the *Ticonderoga* and the *Constellation*.

Question. You, I think, said that the carriers were in the Gulf of Tonkin?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes.

Question. They have moved up. They are shown as being outside.

Secretary McNAMARA. The *Ticonderoga* is essentially in the Gulf area and the *Constellation* has been moving in this direction.

Question. Sir, will this be one strike or several strikes?

Secretary McNAMARA. There are obviously more than one aircraft from each carrier participating in it, but it is basically one strike, unless there are further unprovoked attacks on our vessels.

Question. This is just a retaliatory strike, then?

Secretary McNAMARA. I simply want to leave it as I said it.

Question. Can you describe the weapons or type of aircraft being used?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, they are typical aircraft from attack carriers.

Question. Do you know whether the strike has been successful at all?

Secretary McNAMARA. I am sure it will be successful.

Question. Can you tell us whether they have encountered any aircraft opposition or any interdiction by air?

Secretary McNAMARA. The strikes are continuing so I can't give you any progress report on it.

Question. How many aircraft are involved on our part?

Secretary McNAMARA. The aircraft from two attack carriers.

Question. No numbers?

Secretary McNAMARA. I can't give you any more information.

Question. The presumption is conventional weapons.

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes. Not only presumption, but that is the fact.

Question. What did CIC radar show the course of the three unidentified aircraft to be from? Hainan?

Secretary McNAMARA. We don't have any report on the course of the aircraft.

Question. How many casualty reports on the strikes?

Secretary McNAMARA. There have been none so far. There have been no casualties so far.

Question. What time was the strike launched?

Secretary McNAMARA. I prefer not to give you the exact time of launch.

Question. Were the aircraft from the *Constellation* involved in the operation of the *Maddox* and *Joy*?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes. This is a question I should clarify for you. I may not have

made it clear. The question is were aircraft from the *Constellation* involved in the protective cover during the attacks on the two destroyers August 4th, and the answer is yes. The *Constellation* and the *Ticonderoga* alternated in providing air cap for the destroyers on the 4th.

Question. Mr. Secretary, I am sure there is no doubt in your mind that these PT boats came from, in fact, North Vietnam?

Secretary McNAMARA. There is none. The radar made it quite clear that they were coming from North Vietnamese bases.

Question. Mr. Secretary, can you tell us the distance over which this engagement occurred? Is it about 60 or 65 miles?

Secretary McNAMARA. These are about 60 miles square (indicating) so you can see during this period of time from 7:40 when there was an indication that an attack was imminent, until some time around midnight, to 1:30, when it terminated, they covered a distance of something on the order of 80 miles.

Question. Mr. Secretary, can you give us the basic reasons for the Gulf of Tonkin patrol?

Secretary McNAMARA. It is a routine patrol of the type we carry out in international waters all over the world.

Question. Does it have anything to do with movements of junks or whatever it is back and forth?

Secretary McNAMARA. No. It has no special relationship to any operations in that area. We are carrying routine patrols of this kind on all over the world all the time.

Question. Mr. Secretary, do you have any idea why the North Vietnamese may have done this?

Secretary McNAMARA. None.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you mentioned that the destroyer at one point was under attack by automatic weapons. Does that mean both destroyers, or just the *Maddox*?

Secretary McNAMARA. The report was, I believe, that both destroyers had been attacked by automatic weapons.

Question. Mr. Secretary, have we picked up any survivors?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, we have picked up no survivors on either the second or the fourth.

Question. Mr. Secretary, the reinforcements moving from the Western Pacific and the Coast, are they of all services?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes.

Question. Mr. Secretary, has SAC and Air Defense Command been placed on an increased alert?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, it has not.

Question. Mr. Secretary, can you tell us when this attack, this strike, may be over, or when we may expect further details?

Secretary McNAMARA. I would think that you might expect some further details tomorrow morning.

Question. Have there been any casualties, any damage, anything whatsoever with American Forces?

Secretary McNAMARA. There have been no casualties to American forces, either sea or air, and no damage to American forces to date, either sea or air.

Question. That includes the current air strike?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes, but as I point out, the current air strikes are not completed yet.

Question. Has there been opposition?

Secretary McNAMARA. I cannot report on that until we get the full mission report which we don't have at the present time.

Question. What is the closest, roughly, that the attacking craft have come to the *Maddox* and *Joy*?

Secretary McNAMARA. We have had reports of torpedoes 100 and 200 yards off the beam of the ships. I can't tell you how close the attacking craft came to the vessels, although if they were firing automatic weapons they

must have been closer than 800 yards at a minimum.

Question. Who opened fire first?

Secretary McNAMARA. It was quite clear that the PT boats initiated the attack.

Question. When was the last time that there were destroyers up there in the Tonkin Gulf?

Secretary McNAMARA. I prefer not to answer the question other than to say that we have been carrying on routine patrols in that area for months.

Question. How far up do you go, Mr. Secretary, before they turn back?

Secretary McNAMARA. I prefer not to answer that, either. We don't wish to identify the course of our operations in the area.

Question. Can you tell us what order the strike aircraft have, if they encounter interceptor aircraft in North Vietnam?

Secretary McNAMARA. They are to destroy any aircraft that are in a position to attack them.

Question. Do we have—

Question. On the ground?

Secretary McNAMARA. In the air.

Question. We have troops from the Far East Asia to—well, does that mean ground forces are being put into South Vietnam?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, it means we are reinforcing our forces with such additional forces we believe to be required and have placed on alert such forces as we believe to be necessary.

I don't wish to identify the types or numbers or names or locations of those forces.

Question. Can you repeat that first part about no troops in Vietnam?

Secretary McNAMARA. The question was: Have additional troops been moved into North Vietnam, meaning have combat units been moved into North Vietnam—I meant South Vietnam—and the answer is no.

Question. Are we hitting only shore installations, or do we move inland?

Secretary McNAMARA. I referred to patrol craft bases and supporting logistical installations in close proximity to but geographically separate from.

Question. Mr. Secretary, have there been any similar aggressive actions on the part of the North Vietnamese navy short of the torpedoing that we didn't bother to report before?

Secretary McNAMARA. No.

Question. This was the first time?

Secretary McNAMARA. That is right. I want to emphasize that these attacks both on Sunday and today, both on the second of August and the fourth of August, occurred in international waters. These destroyers were operating between 30 and 60 miles off the North Vietnamese coast.

Question. Can you tell us what towns, cities, or whatever on the Vietnamese coast are roughly closest or parallel to the area of attack?

Secretary McNAMARA. No.

Question. Not our attack but theirs on us.

Secretary McNAMARA. No.

Question. How far off was the 7:40 P.M.? Was that 60 miles?

Secretary McNAMARA. These squares are 60 miles, so this point is on the order of 65 miles, perhaps. As you can see down here, it is something a little less than that.

Question. Mr. Secretary, some of our readers will find it difficult to understand how the two destroyers were chased, and apparently from this maneuver they made, they ran from these PT boats and yet they were sufficiently—

Secretary McNAMARA. No, this is their course of patrol (indicating).

Question. While under attack?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes, they were proceeding south.

Question. Once they were engaged they didn't turn?

Secretary McNAMARA. No. This is the approximate direction they moved in (indicat-

ing). Of course, they were taking evasive action during that period of time to avoid the torpedoes which were launched against them.

Question. But if they were sufficiently close to be illuminated by the PT boats, the question a reader will have is how come the destroyers weren't able to nullify the PT boats.

Secretary McNAMARA. They did. They sunk at least two.

Question. Two out of how many, sir?

Secretary McNAMARA. We can't be sure. It was a night attack. We can't be certain of the total number of boats that were engaged. I will give you an estimate, just for your own information, although I can't be absolutely certain of these numbers. I would say between three and six boats were engaged in the attack, of which at least two were sunk.

Question. How did you know that?

Question. And in which they were engaged for a period of, I believe, two hours?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes.

Question. How did you know they were sunk, those two?

Question. Were these sunk by destroyer fire or aircraft fire?

Secretary McNAMARA. I can't identify the source of the sinking.

Question. Did you use the five inch and three inch batteries? Is that all?

Secretary McNAMARA. The five inch batteries plus certain automatic weapons available on the destroyers were used.

Question. Mr. Secretary, the earlier statement put out said they were believed to have been sunk. Is this later information they have been sunk?

Secretary McNAMARA. It has been reported to us that they were sunk. This, let me emphasize, was a night action. You must expect certain restrictions in the amount of information available under night conditions. But the report to us from sources that we believe are reliable indicates that at least two vessels were sunk.

Question. Sir, are you confident that one PT boat was sunk on Sunday?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes, that is correct.

Question. But is this later information that makes it more likely that they were sunk?

Secretary McNAMARA. Just five minutes before I came down, I received a report that they were sunk.

Question. In other words, the later information is flat?

Secretary McNAMARA. I just want to repeat what I said, that the report was that two PT boats at least were sunk, and a possible third. That is right.

Question. Can you tell us at all whether any of the damage was inflicted by five inch guns?

Secretary McNAMARA. No. This was night time. I can't identify the type of shell that caused the damage, or even the source of the damage as between destroyers on the one hand, and our aircraft on the other.

Question. Mr. Secretary, could you give us a rundown on the remaining portion of the North Vietnamese Navy? Jane's Fighting Ships says they have a total of 16 PT boats, of which I figure you have sunk now one fifth.

Secretary McNAMARA. I don't wish to give you our estimate of the number of North Vietnamese boats by type, for obvious reasons, but I will tell you there are two different types. One type we identify as the PT-4's. This is a patrol craft with a speed of approximately 50 knots. The other type we identify as the Swatow type, a patrol craft with a lesser speed, approximating 40 knots. We believe that both types of patrol craft were engaged in today's operation.

Question. How do you spell Swatow?

Secretary McNAMARA. S-w-a-t-o-w.

June 2, 1966

Question. Mr. Secretary, approximately how many hostile torpedoes were fired at our ships?

Secretary McNAMARA. It is very difficult to estimate. I don't wish to make a guess at them.

Question. How many do they carry, sir?

Secretary McNAMARA. I don't wish to approximate that, either.

Question. Has your government been in touch during today or since Sunday with the Government of the Soviet Union on those incidents?

Secretary McNAMARA. I would rather not discuss that.

Question. Mr. Secretary—

Secretary McNAMARA. One more question.

Question. I have three sunk in my notes.

Secretary McNAMARA. One sunk on Sunday, at least two sunk today, possibly a third sunk today, for a total of possibly four, as a possible.

Question. And the last one is a possible.

Secretary McNAMARA. The possible third one today which would make a four possible in total.

Question. Did you say the nearest torpedoes were about 200 yards away?

Secretary McNAMARA. Torpedoes were reported as passing between 100 and 200 yards abeam of the ships. One more question.

Question. Can you set something up for tomorrow?

Secretary McNAMARA. I will see that you are provided with whatever news we can properly release. I will either do it myself or arrange for others to do it.

Question. How about tonight?

Secretary McNAMARA. I don't believe there will be anything tonight. I will be receiving reports. I am going to stay in the building tonight and receive reports every half hour from CINCPAC. But I doubt that there will be anything to release tonight.

The Press. Thank you, sir.

End, 12:30 a.m.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PRESS BRIEFING BY
HON. ROBERT S. McNAMARA, SECRETARY OF
DEFENSE, 9 A.M., WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1964

Secretary McNAMARA. As you know, on August 2nd, and again on August 4th, North Vietnamese surface vessels attacked U.S. destroyers operating on routine patrol in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin.

In retaliation for this unprovoked attack on the high seas, our forces have struck the bases used by the North Vietnamese patrol craft. During the night, 64 attack sorties were launched from the U.S. carriers *Ticonderoga* and *Constellation* against the four North Vietnamese patrol bases and certain support facilities associated with those bases.

The points are located on this map showing the Gulf of Tonkin, South China, North Viet Nam. The first base is at Hon Gay in North Viet Nam; the second at Loc Chao; the third at Phuoloi; the fourth at Quang Khe; and the fifth strike was against the Vinh oil storage depot, which is associated with the Swatow torpedo base.

The oil storage depot, which contains 14 tanks, approximately 10 percent of the total petroleum storage capacity of North Viet Nam, was 90 percent destroyed. Smoke was observed rising to 14,000 feet. In addition to the damage to the torpedo boat bases and their support facilities, approximately 25 of the boats were damaged or destroyed.

Two of our aircraft were lost, two of our aircraft were damaged, all others have been recovered safely on the carriers. The destroyers *Maddox* and *Turner Joy*, which have been operating on routine patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin, have resumed their patrol operations in international waters.

Last night I announced that moves were underway to reinforce our forces in the Pacific area. These moves include the following actions: First, an attack carrier group

has been transferred from the First Fleet on the Pacific Coast to the Western Pacific. Secondly, interceptor and fighter bomber aircraft have been moved into South Viet Nam. Thirdly, fighter bomber aircraft have been moved into Thailand. Fourthly, interceptor and fighter bomber squadrons have been transferred from the United States into advance bases in the Pacific. Fifthly, anti-submarine task force group has been moved into the South China Sea. And finally, selected Army and Marine forces have been alerted and readied for movement.

I want to emphasize that the damage report which I gave to you is based on preliminary reports received shortly after the completion of operations.

Now I will take your questions and endeavor to answer them.

Question. Mr. Secretary, were the planes that we lost, the two planes, downed by ground fire, and also, was there any air action from North Viet Nam?

Secretary McNAMARA. The two planes we lost were downed by antiaircraft fire. There was no enemy air reaction.

Question. Mr. Secretary, can you tell us the height of the attack? How low did they come?

Secretary McNAMARA. Generally, the strikes were at low level.

Question. And the local times, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary McNAMARA. The local times ranged from on the order of Noon to 4:00 or 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon.

Question. Can you tell us, sir, how long the attack—

Secretary McNAMARA. These are local Vietnamese times.

Question. Can you tell us how long the entire strike lasted?

Secretary McNAMARA. Roughly four to five hours.

Question. How was the weather?

Secretary McNAMARA. Bad.

Question. Rainy?

Secretary McNAMARA. Low ceiling.

Question. What types of antiaircraft fire?

Secretary McNAMARA. There was heavy antiaircraft fire over several of the targets.

Question. Missiles?

Secretary McNAMARA. Guns rather than missiles.

Question. Small caliber or big caliber?

Secretary McNAMARA. I can't tell you the caliber other than it was heavy antiaircraft bases.

Question. Can you tell us at which of these places the planes were downed?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, I can't.

Question. What was the question?

Secretary McNAMARA. The question was at which point were the two aircraft lost. I can simply say that the heaviest antiaircraft fire was received at Hon Gay, the most northerly of the bases attacked.

Question. Is that also the largest?

Secretary McNAMARA. It is the largest; yes.

Question. At the torpedo bases themselves, can you describe the damage itself as light or heavy?

Secretary McNAMARA. It is too early to say. We will have to wait until the pilots' reports have been assessed.

Question. And the number of American casualties?

Secretary McNAMARA. Two. Two pilots were lost, one in each of the two downed aircraft.

Question. Are you giving out their names?

Secretary McNAMARA. Not until their nearest of kin have been notified.

Question. That will be sometime today?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes, it will.

Question. Were they picked up?

Secretary McNAMARA. We believe they were lost.

Question. At sea or land?

Secretary McNAMARA. At sea.

Question. Will we take reconnaissance missions over there?

Secretary McNAMARA. We will take such action as is necessary to determine the results of our operations.

Question. How much of the petroleum supply did you say?

Secretary McNAMARA. Approximately 10 percent of the petroleum capacity of North Viet Nam is located at Vinh, the point that was struck. Approximately 90 percent of that 10 percent was destroyed.

Question. Are these the only four torpedo boat bases?

Secretary McNAMARA. These four are the main bases. With a coastline such as this, of course, the boats occasionally use other areas for staging areas.

Question. Can you tell us what percentage it is of their total fleet?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, I can't, except that it is a very substantial percentage.

Question. Mr. Secretary, how do you explain these attacks?

Secretary McNAMARA. I can't explain them. They were unprovoked. As I told you last night, our vessels were clearly in international waters. Our vessels, when attacked, were operating in this area, roughly 60 miles off of the North Vietnamese coast.

Question. There have been reports that South Vietnamese vessels were showing or taking some sort of action against North Viet Nam approximately at this time.

Secretary McNAMARA. No, to the best of my knowledge, there were no operations during the period I was describing last night.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what orders now for either the Seventh Fleet or for these particular units of the Seventh Fleet?

Secretary McNAMARA. Our orders to the commanders are to continue their patrols, to protect themselves against aggression on the high seas with whatever force is necessary.

Question. Has there been any word—

Question. Mr. Secretary, would you say this will be all that will be necessary, that the attack has met its objectives?

Secretary McNAMARA. Whether this is all that is necessary depends entirely on the North Vietnamese.

Question. Do you think the air strike accomplished its objectives?

Secretary McNAMARA. The air strike very clearly made clear to the North Vietnamese our intention to maintain our right to operate on the high seas. That was the objective. I think that has been accomplished.

Question. Wasn't the objective to wipe out the PT boat fleet?

Secretary McNAMARA. Our objective was to deter the PT boat fleet from further attacks on our vessels. I believe we have accomplished that.

Question. Were any attempts made, Mr. Secretary, to go after the antiaircraft batteries?

Secretary McNAMARA. There were no actions against the antiaircraft batteries. The attack was against the patrol boat bases and the associated facilities.

Question. Mr. Secretary, last night there were three bogies reported, three unidentified aircraft. Did we ever find out in which direction they came from?

Secretary McNAMARA. We have no identification on those aircraft. They did not participate in the attacks on our vessels.

Question. Sir, are there villages or towns adjacent to or linked up with these bases?

Secretary McNAMARA. There were no civilian centers close to the bases which were attacked last night.

Question. Mr. Secretary, could you give us the estimate of how many percent of the North Vietnamese patrol boat fleet has been destroyed or damaged?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, I can't estimate for you the exact percent destroyed or dam-

11514

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 2, 1966

aged, other than to say that it was a very substantial percentage of their fleet.

One more question.

Question. From what you say, there are no further actions of this kind going on at the moment, or planned. Is that correct?

Secretary McNAMARA. No operations are being carried on by our forces at the present time, other than the continuation of the routine patrol activities of the *Turner Joy* and the *Maddox*, the two destroyers which have been operating in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Thank you very much.

The Press. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(At this point Mr. HARRIS, the Acting President pro tempore, assumed the chair.)

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 985) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 578

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending legislation which I ask to have printed.

I assure all Senators that I will not call it up until after the disposition of the Cotton amendment, which I understand is set for 4 o'clock on Monday next; but I ask that this amendment be printed, and give my colleagues notice that I may call it up subsequent to the vote on the Cotton amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

SOUTH VIETNAM REQUESTS UNITED NATIONS OBSERVERS AT ELECTIONS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on May 12, 1966, I introduced a resolution which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Republic of South Vietnam is actively engaged in making preparations for elections to choose a constituent assembly in a constructive effort to bring about a more representative government, and

Whereas the United States is dedicated to the principle, in the conduct of its foreign affairs, that peoples everywhere have the right to determine their own destinies through free participation in elected governments; and

Whereas the success of the promised elections in South Vietnam will depend on the assurance that they will be free, fair, and open; and

Whereas the United States has committed its resources and the lives of its men to the cause of freedom for the South Vietnamese people; and

Whereas an objective and international presence would make a significant contribution to assuring that the promised elections in South Vietnam are free, fair, and open, and thus help substantially in bringing about political stability and the establishment of effective political institutions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should encourage the Government of South Vietnam to seek United Nations observers for its forthcoming elections; and

That the President should call upon the United Nations to assign United Nations observers to the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam.

I am pleased to announce that United Press International reported a few minutes ago from the United Nations that South Vietnam today formally requested United Nations observers for its elections of a constituent assembly in September. The dispatch reads as follows:

UNITED NATIONS.—South Vietnam today formally requested U.N. observers for its elections of a constituent assembly in September.

The request was put verbally to Secretary General Thant by Ambassador Nguyen Duy Lien, South Vietnamese observer to the United Nations.

It was not immediately clear whether the Saigon Government wanted the world organization immediately to send observers or whether it envisaged a supervisory role for the U.N. in the elections.

A U.S. spokesman said Lien "informed the Secretary General that the Government of South Vietnam intends to hold elections for a constituent assembly in September and requested the United Nations to send observers."

He said South Vietnam would make its request in writing later.

Only last weekend, before the request was made, Thant said in Windsor, Ont., he could not see the use of U.N. supervision of Vietnamese elections "at this time."

On his return from Europe on May 5, Thant also said he saw no possibility of a U.N. supervisory role in Vietnamese elections because it would run into Soviet opposition in the Security Council.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that the President had a distinct role in urging the South Vietnam Government to make this request of the United Nations. I think this is a most important breakthrough, and very important for the future of the entire Vietnam problem.

Mr. RIBICOFF subsequently said: Mr. President, I have just talked with the President of the United States and our Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg, concerning the request of Saigon to the United Nations to send observers for the elections which are to take place in South Vietnam in September.

Both the President and Ambassador Goldberg told me that the proposal from Saigon for United Nations participation has their wholehearted support. It is the hope of the President that the United Nations will act on the request of the Saigon government and send observers to South Vietnam to observe these most important elections.

When the suggestion that the U.N. play a role in the South Vietnamese elections was first made by me on May 5, it was welcomed by the President. But the President was dealing with an independent government, and it was necessary for Saigon itself to make the request.

Now the request has been made. And now, of course, the problem is whether the United Nations will accede to the request of the Saigon government. In the final analysis, U Thant, Secretary General, has no power independent of the power given to him by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

The decision as to whether the United Nations will play a role in the Saigon elections will depend in large part upon the Soviet Union and France. In the forthcoming discussions, those two Nations will play the critical roles.

The Soviet Union and France have a duty not to block the request which was made by Saigon for observers at their elections.

Our Ambassador to the United Nations will have something more to say at the White House, within a few minutes, and he will also make his position known before the United Nations. But it is very encouraging that both the President and Ambassador Goldberg support wholeheartedly the request for United Nations participation in the upcoming South Vietnam elections.

It is my hope that the Secretary General will use all his influence, all his persuasive abilities, and also the prestige of his office, to prevail upon the other members of the United Nations to accede to the request of Saigon, to the end that these elections will be fair; and to the end that these elections will be of a nature which, once held, will merit the confidence not only of the people of South Vietnam but also of the people of the entire world.

For the forthcoming election of a constituent assembly affords a great opportunity. The process will have been begun which can lead to the election of a government which will truly represent the people of South Vietnam.

I noticed that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has been making such clear statements on this subject, whose position is so well known throughout the country and who, time and time again, has asked for United Nations participation—has just come into the Chamber.

For the benefit of the Senator from Oregon, let me repeat that the Government of South Vietnam has asked for United Nations supervision of the September election. This can be a great step forward—one which I have been urging for some time and one called for in the Senate resolution I introduced last month.

An international presence is essential if the contending groups in South Vietnam and the nations of the world are to have full confidence in the outcome of the elections. Only free and honest elections can lead to a resolution of the problems that plague South Vietnam.

I talked today with President Johnson and Ambassador Arthur Goldberg. The South Vietnamese request has the enthusiastic and strong support of the President. Ambassador Goldberg will carry the proposal to the United Nations with vigor and conviction.

Now the matter rests with Russia and France. With their support, the United Nations can play a vital role in South Vietnam. Without their support, it will be difficult. I hope that Russia responds

tended, while we were trying to work out a resolution of the situation in Vietnam.

Mr. JAVITS. From our point of view, it is best to let the people decide. When the people have decided, then our mission, for all practical purposes, will have been accomplished—so long, of course, as they are permitted to implement their decision in peace. We may have to fight for the purpose of implementation afterward, but that ground is sounder than the ground on which we now stand.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator from New York and I are in agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that the Soviet Union is involved in this situation up to its armpits, and the world has not recognized that. We know that detente should be their first priority, as it was with Khrushchev. It is not now their first priority. Now their first priority is beating the Communist Chinese for the leadership of the Communist world.

I join the Senator from Connecticut in the hope that the Soviet Union will be made to see the light by the impact of world opinion. As we have seen many times, world opinion has an effect upon the Soviet Union.

DIVERSION OF WELFARE FUNDS OF LABOR UNIONS IN NEW YORK

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations last year held hearings on the diversion of approximately \$4 million from the welfare funds of two labor unions in New York, the Allied Trades Council and Teamsters Local 815. The hearings disclosed that the funds had been diverted to so-called research foundations—one in Liberia and the other in Puerto Rico, completely controlled by the dominant figure in the unions, George Barasch.

Federal officials testified that the law was inadequate to prevent the diversion of the welfare funds. As a result of the hearings, I introduced a bill, S. 2627, which was cosponsored by seven other members of the subcommittee, to prevent such occurrences.

Immediately following the hearings, the general counsel of the subcommittee initiated a series of conferences with the attorneys for George Barasch and his associates seeking the return of the diverted funds to the joint welfare fund of the unions.

Federal agencies with jurisdiction in this matter, including the Labor, Justice, and Treasury Departments, were consulted, as were representatives of the State of New Jersey and the New York State Insurance Department. In late July of 1965, the attorneys for George Barasch and his associates expressed their willingness to return the \$4 million forthwith.

At this juncture, however, the New York State Insurance Department, whose representatives had been invited to join the conferences, asked for a delay in the restoration of the funds in order to review the record of the case to determine whether any New York State statutes had been violated. They indicated that an

acceptance of a settlement might compromise any possible prosecution.

Mr. President, that was about 10 months ago. During the interim we have patiently awaited the result of the re-examination of this matter by the New York State officials. Within the past week we learned that their work was finally completed; that apparently no violations of New York State statutes had been disclosed; nor had any new information been added to supplement the subcommittee's voluminous record.

It had been agreed between the subcommittee's general counsel, Jerome S. Adlerman, and counsel for the New York State insurance department, George Bernstein, that the subcommittee would be advised of the return of the funds and that the New York State officials would join this subcommittee in a simultaneous public announcement of the restoration of the money.

Instead, yesterday, in New York, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller publicly released information implying that the New York State insurance department was solely responsible for the recovery of the welfare funds. The subcommittee was informed of this news release sometime after it had been made.

I regret that the disclosure of the return of this money was made in disregard of the agreement and understanding previously entered into.

However, the record speaks for itself. The New York State insurance department awoke to the fact that a matter in its jurisdiction warranted intensive investigation only after our committee hearings had disclosed the misuse of the money. I think the State and the Federal Government should cooperate in the protection of the rights and interests of American workingmen, and that is exactly what we have sought to do.

Mr. President, I have prepared a factual account of these matters for the use and information of the press, and it has now been released. I ask unanimous consent that the statement I prepared for the press be printed at this point in the Record.

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

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN (D., Ark.) today announced that approximately \$4,200,000 which had been diverted from the Welfare Funds of two New York area unions, as disclosed during 1965 hearings of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, has been returned to the Allied Welfare Fund on behalf of about 10,000 members of the Allied Trades Council and Teamsters Local 815.

Testimony in the Subcommittee hearings last year showed that the money had been diverted from dormant Welfare Funds of the unions to overseas "research" foundations, one in Monrovia, Liberia, and the other in Puerto Rico.

The restoration of the \$4,200,000 to the Allied Welfare Fund, which provides health and welfare benefits to the membership of the two unions, is the direct result of negotiations initiated by the Subcommittee in the summer of 1965, immediately after the hearings relating to the diversion of the funds. The General Counsel of the Subcommittee entered negotiations at that time with attorneys for George Barasch and his

associates seeking the return of all of the funds. Barasch was formerly the principal officer of the two unions and the dominant figure in control of the funds and the foundations.

After Barasch had expressed through his attorneys his agreement to return the funds, the New York State Insurance Department, which exercises jurisdiction over Welfare Funds in New York State, asked the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations to delay action for the return of these funds pending the Department's review of the matters disclosed by the Subcommittee hearings. The New York State authorities sought to determine whether there had been any violation of State laws in this case.

In August of 1965, Senator McCLELLAN acceded to the New York State request. The State proceeded with its investigation and apparently finally determined that New York State statutes did not provide penalties for the diversion of the welfare funds. The \$4,200,000 was returned to the Welfare Funds under the supervision of the New York State Insurance Department.

George Barasch has resigned from his positions as lifetime trustee for each of the several employee welfare and pension benefit plans of the two unions, including the two major plans, the Allied Welfare Fund and the Union Mutual Fund. New employee trustees have been selected for the funds, as required by the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act that govern joint trust funds.

The trust agreements of the two unions have been reviewed and revised in order to establish proper safeguards for the rights and interests of the rank-and-file members of the unions who are their participants.

Senator McCLELLAN stated that the total sum of \$4,200,000 represents all of the holdings of the Cromwell Research Foundation of Puerto Rico, the Chemical Research Foundation of Liberia, and the Caribbean Educational Association of Puerto Rico. The agreement between Mr. Barasch and certain associates, who are the officials of the overseas foundations, and the new trustees of the Allied Welfare Fund provides that the money that has been returned will be utilized for charitable and education purposes that will benefit the almost 10,000 members of the Allied Trades Council and Teamsters Local # 815, and that New York State authorities will supervise the administration of the funds by the trustees.

Additionally, the overseas foundations in Liberia and Puerto Rico will be dissolved.

The Subcommittee's report to the Senate on the investigation into the diversion of the welfare funds has not yet been filed. Filing was withheld until New York authorities acted upon the agreement made last summer by attorneys for Mr. Barasch to return the diverted funds. Senator McCLELLAN stated that the report will be filed in the near future.

As a result of the Subcommittee's hearing on these welfare funds, Senator McCLELLAN introduced S. 2627, a bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act for the purpose of providing additional safeguards for the rights and interests of participants and beneficiaries of employee benefit plans. The bill, which has been referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has as co-sponsor seven of the other members of the Subcommittee.

Senator McCLELLAN stated his hope that the Subcommittee's hearings also have served to alert American workers who are participants in employee benefit plans to the dangers inherent in lack of interest and in failure to participate actively in union affairs.

The Subcommittee will continue to examine the administration and disbursement of welfare and pension funds, and may hold hearings in the future after additional investigations in the field.

June 2, 1966

Mr. McCLELLAN. In addition, Mr. President, I also have a letter addressed to the general counsel of the subcommittee, which he received today from the attorneys for Mr. Barasch and his associates. This letter states clearly that General Counsel Adlerman had obtained an understanding, after the hearings almost 10 months ago, that the funds held by these two overseas foundations would be returned to the Allied Welfare Fund.

Mr. President, I do not necessarily endorse all of the comments in the letter. I refer particularly to the attorneys' request that the subcommittee's report reflect "the cooperation given by our clients and that no evidence of wrongdoing on their part was shown by the testimony." I understand that the attorneys for Mr. Barasch and his associates cooperated very well with the subcommittee. However, their clients did not cooperate freely with the subcommittee's staff once they understood the purpose of our investigation. They exercised, without exception, their constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment.

Further, while Barasch and his associates may not have violated any existing Federal statutes in diverting the welfare funds, it is questionable whether they were faithful to the responsibility and obligation imposed upon any person acting in a fiduciary capacity. With this comment upon the letter, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LAW OFFICES OF
MARTIN J. McNAMARA, JR.,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1966.

HON. JEROME S. ADLERMAN,
General Counsel, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ADLERMAN: The undersigned have appeared as attorneys for respective clients, Cromwell Research Foundation, Inc., Chemical Research Foundation, Inc., Local 815 (IBT), Allied Trades Council (AFL-CIO) George Barasch and others, in the course of an investigation conducted by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Upon completion of the public hearings last summer you gave graciously of your time, and joined us in a cooperative endeavor to meet some of the objections to the foundations, which had been the subject matters of your inquiry.

As a result of these efforts we arrived at an understanding whereby the directors of the Chemical Research Foundation, Inc., and the Cromwell Research Foundation, Inc., would transfer approximately \$4,000,000 by grant to the Allied Welfare Fund.

At this point the New York State Department of Insurance, which had participated in the foregoing discussions, indicated a desire to negotiate separately and directly with the parties due to certain differences in views and objectives. Thus it became necessary to renegotiate, and, with your acquiescence, to consummate an understanding with that Department.

We are now pleased to advise you that we have concluded our negotiations; executed copies of the respective instruments and grants will be forwarded to you promptly.

The directors of these foundations, as well as Mr. George Barasch and the other individuals involved, were completely cooperative in arriving at the above disposition; however, it should be emphasized that the cooperation

received from you and your staff was indispensable in laying the groundwork for the final result.

We respectfully request that in the event there is to be a report rendered by your committee relative to the investigation, it should reflect the cooperation given by our clients, and that no evidence of wrongdoing on their part was shown by the testimony.

Kindly accept our thanks for the time you expended in assisting us with this matter, as well as the appreciation of our clients.

Respectfully,

KRIEGER, CHODASH & POLITAN,
By HAROLD KRIEGER,
KOSTELANETZ & RITHOLZ,
By JULES RITHOLZ,
MARTIN J. McNAMARA, JR.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is no doubt that had not the subcommittee investigated this matter and exposed the wrongful diversion of these welfare funds, the money never would have been recovered, and the workingmen for whom the funds were established would have been robbed of the benefits and never would have received the benefits to which they are entitled.

We are happy that the funds have been recovered. Although there may not have been a technical violation of law, we are of the opinion that there was a violation of a moral obligation and a fiduciary responsibility on the part of the officials who took the welfare funds and established charitable foundations in foreign countries and transferred all the funds to those countries. Not only did they do that, but also they made themselves trustees of the funds, and perpetuated themselves for life, together with their children or grandchildren and future generations from now into eternity.

ELECTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had not expected to speak today on the subject of Vietnam. I had expected to speak tomorrow.

I have a high regard for the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], to whom I extend my sincere compliments for the position that he has taken on the Vietnam issue, with respect to the proposal for supervised elections. When I entered in the Chamber and heard the Senator from Connecticut speaking, I decided that I owed it to my record to make a few comments on the subject, particularly in light of the colloquy that has occurred between the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

It is interesting to note that the President of the United States and the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Goldberg, will announce or have announced that they urge U.S. supervision of any elections to be held in South Vietnam, and that the Saigon Government—a reprehensible government—is asking the United Nations, so the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] said on the floor of the Senate, to participate in some supervisory capacity in connection with such elections as are held in Vietnam.

My reaction to this announcement is that it is a diversionary tactic away from

the basic issues that confront the world. The views of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], shared by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], would direct attention to the position taken by France and Russia.

I have directed attention to that position for some 3 years on the floor of the Senate, as I have urged my Government to put France and Russia on the spot in the United Nations and take our own country off the spot by urging that the signatories to the United Nations—including, of course, all members of the Security Council, permanent and non-permanent, and all members of the General Assembly—carry out their treaty obligation.

It is rather difficult for an outlaw country to ask other countries to enforce the law, but that is what our country should have done as an outlaw for the past 3 years. Unpleasant as it is to the ears of many Americans, the sad fact is that the United States is a shocking outlaw in southeast Asia and has been from the very beginning of the intervention for all the reasons that I have stated and restated in this historic debate for some 3 years in the Senate.

I shall continue to restate the reasons because more and more people are going to the record and more and more people, as the President loses more and more support across the land—which he deserves to lose—are beginning to recognize the sordid and sad record of the United States in southeast Asia.

If there are going to be elections in Vietnam, as I said earlier this afternoon, they will be characterized by fraud and by meaninglessness, for they will be conducted in those areas in which that shocking little tyrant by the name of Ky, whom we have been supporting, will be in pistol control.

I am at a loss to understand what makes anyone think that there will be any free elections in a situation supported by an American puppet military junta which is what the government of South Vietnam is.

It will be interesting to see the position that the United Nations takes in regard to the forthcoming request that has been announced on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

It will be interesting to see whether the United Nations, is allowed to supervise the selection of the candidates, or merely the balloting procedures.

It will be interesting to see whether the United Nations will exercise some supervisory mission in connection with the elections—and I happen to think that they should—but not take jurisdiction over the entire threat to the peace of the world. What the United Nations should do is to call all the parties to an accounting.

Before the ink was dry on the Geneva accords, which we refused to sign, but which our President and Secretary of State in 1954 said we would respect as tenets of international law, we began violating them.

Starting with those violations, the United Nations has hesitated and failed to call the United States to the account-

ing that it should have been called to for violation of not only the Geneva accords, but also of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD those provisions of the statement of policy of July 1954, adopted by the signatories to the Geneva accords, of which the United States on the very face of the accords stands in violation.

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

12. FINAL DECLARATION OF GENEVA CONFERENCE, JULY 21, 1954¹

Final declaration, dated July 21, 1954, of the Geneva Conference on the problem of restoring peace in Indo-China, in which the representatives of Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, France, Laos, the People's Republic of China, the State of Viet-Nam, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America took part.

1. The Conference takes note of the agreements ending hostilities in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam and organizing international control and the supervision of the execution of the provisions of these agreements.

2. The Conference expresses satisfaction at the ending of hostilities in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam; the Conference expresses its conviction that the execution of the provisions set out in the present declaration and in the agreements on the cessation of hostilities will permit Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam henceforth to play their part, in full independence and sovereignty, in the peaceful community of nations.

3. The Conference takes note of the declarations made by the Governments of Cambodia and of Laos of their intention to adopt measures permitting all citizens to take their place in the national community, in particular by participating in the next general elections, which, in conformity with the constitution of each of these countries, shall take place in the course of the year 1955, by secret ballot and in conditions of respect for fundamental freedoms.

4. The Conference takes note of the clauses in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam prohibiting the introduction into Viet-Nam of foreign troops and military personnel as well as of all kinds of arms and munitions. The Conference also takes note of the declarations made by the Governments of Cambodia and Laos of their resolution not to request foreign aid, whether in war material, in personnel or in instructors except for the purpose of the effective defence of their territory and, in the case of Laos, to the extent defined by the agreements on the cessation of hostilities in Laos.

5. The Conference takes note of the clauses in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam to the effect that no military base under the control of a foreign State may be established in the regrouping zones of the two parties, the latter having the obligation to see that the zones allotted to them shall not constitute part of any military alliance and shall not be utilized for the resumption of hostilities or in the service of an aggressive policy. The Conference also takes note of the declarations of the Governments of Cambodia and Laos to the effect that they will not join in any agreement with other States if this agreement includes the obligation to participate in a military alliance not in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations or, in the case of Laos, with the principles of the agreement on the cessation of

hostilities in Laos or, so long as their security is not threatened, the obligation to establish bases on Cambodian or Laotian territory for the military forces of foreign Powers.

6. The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Viet-Nam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary. The Conference expresses its conviction that the execution of the provisions set out in the present declaration and in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities creates the necessary basis for the achievement in the near future of a political settlement in Viet-Nam.

7. The Conference declares that, so far as Viet-Nam is concerned, the settlement of political problems, effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity, shall permit the Viet-Namese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot. In order to ensure that sufficient progress in the restoration of peace has been made, and that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will, general elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission composed of representatives of the Member States of the International Supervisory Commission, referred to in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities. Consultations will be held on this subject between the competent representative authorities of the two zones from 20 July 1955 onwards.

8. The provisions of the agreements on the cessation of hostilities intended to ensure the protection of individuals and of property must be most strictly applied and must, in particular, allow everyone in Viet-Nam to decide freely in which zone he wishes to live.

9. The competent representative authorities of the Northern and Southern zones of Viet-Nam, as well as the authorities of Laos and Cambodia, must not permit any individual or collective reprisals against persons who have collaborated in any way with one of the parties during the war or against members of such persons' families.

10. The Conference takes note of the declaration of the Government of the French Republic to the effect that it is ready to withdraw its troops from the territory of Cambodia, Laos, and Viet-Nam, at the request of the governments concerned and within periods which shall be fixed by agreement between the parties except in the cases where, by agreement between the two parties, a certain number of French troops shall remain at specified points and for a specified time.

11. The Conference takes note of the declaration of the French Government to the effect that for the settlement of all the problems connected with the re-establishment and consolidation of peace in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam, the French Government will proceed from the principle of respect for the independence and sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam.

12. In their relations with Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam, each member of the Geneva Conference undertakes to respect the sovereignty, the independence, the unity and the territorial integrity of the above-mentioned states, and to refrain from any interference in their internal affairs.

13. The members of the Conference agree to consult one another on any question which may be referred to them by the International Supervisory Commission in order to study such measures as may prove necessary to ensure that the agreements on the cessation of hostilities in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam are respected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the material which I have just had printed in the RECORD shows that the Geneva accords prohibit—and that is the language—the sending into Vietnam of any military supplies, of any military aid, or of any military personnel.

From the very beginning, after we took this American puppet, who was a South Vietnamese exile, out of New York City and Washington, D.C.—a man who had never fought the French—and sent him over there and financed him and set him up as a puppet government of the United States, we violated the statement of policy signed by the signatories to the accords.

First, let the United Nations take note of its dereliction in not calling us to an accounting for our violations. Let the Secretary General of the United Nations face up to the fact that he has followed a very ineffective role and has failed in his responsibilities of leadership as Secretary-General by not insisting that either the United Nations or the members of the United Nations live up to the treaty obligations, or else submit his resignation.

I know the argument. "Why, Senator," people say to me, "what can such people do? They cannot control the United Nations." Well, they can resign, instead of being used as pawns—in this case, as Secretary-General, or, I may say, as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations—in aiding and abetting by keeping their jobs, a course that cannot be justified under international law or under any set of principles of morality that we owe to mankind.

Anyone who reads the speeches and take note of the material I have just placed in the RECORD will also observe that the statement of policy of the Geneva accords makes it very clear that the 17th parallel is not a political line of demarcation, but is a military line. Who turned it into a political line of demarcation? The United States. We are the ones who are responsible for setting up, in violation of the Geneva accords, a South Vietnamese Government. It has been an illegal government from the very beginning, and the responsibility for it lies on the United States.

The Geneva accords make crystal clear—the language is irrefutable—that the 17th parallel was to be a line of military demarcation, to the south of which thousands upon thousands of French troops that were in Vietnam at the time should repair; while to the north of it, the Vietminh Army, that fought and defeated the French, should stay until, during the next 2-year period, the Vietnamese people—not the United States—should solve the problem aimed at a united Vietnam.

The United States, more than any other cause, is responsible for splitting Vietnam into two governments, North and South.

Mr. President, many people do not wish to face up to it yet, but this contest, this war, this strife will go on for however many decades it takes for the Vietnamese people to unite their country. Tens of thousands of American boys will be sacrificed unjustifiably and unwar-

¹ IC/43/Rev. 2, 21 July 1954; Original: French

June 2, 1966

rantedly in that civil strife, if we do not stop it.

Mr. President, the Geneva accords made perfectly clear that no bases were to be allowed to be established by a foreign government. We established bases, we maintain them, we are responsible for them. We are guilty of illegal conduct in constructing those bases and in the military aid we sent to South Vietnam as early as 1955.

Mr. President, the accords, as will be seen from the material I have introduced, also made perfectly clear that from July 1954 to July 1956 plans were to be made for the holding of elections in Vietnam—all of Vietnam—to the end of selecting their officers and working out the procedure for a unified Vietnam.

And why should it not be unified? These are one people, engaged in a civil war. Within South Vietnam itself, there is a civil war. The State Department does not like to have that phrase used; but it is interesting that more and more editors are using it now. The senior Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] have been criticized emphatically and in many instances viciously, in the last 3 years, because we have pointed out the undeniable fact that it is a civil war, with overtones and undertones of a religious war also, in which we are unjustifiably killing American boys.

Mr. President, the United Nations will have to face up to the fact that the United States stopped those elections that were planned for July 1956 because our intelligence reports were that if they were held, Ho Chi Minh would be elected president. And of course we have set ourselves up unilaterally to tell the world that we are going to determine the internal affairs of countries that we think are threatened with a Communist takeover, irrespective of what the wishes of the people may be.

That policy is getting us into greater and greater trouble. In my judgment, it is creating great internal stresses in this country, which will become worse, until eventually the American people, in my judgment, will repudiate any government that continues to sacrifice American boys by increasing thousands, as will come to pass if we do not stop our participation in the war. We have already killed over 3,200 of them—young American men who never should have been sent there in the first place. The Pentagon admits that we have wounded over 15,000 of them—more to be wounded and more to die as our President keeps indicating further and further escalation of this war.

Mr. President, these so-called elections in the metropolitan areas of South Vietnam controlled by this military junta are not fundamental to the problems that exists in southeast Asia. What is fundamental is that we obtain a cease-fire. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] talked about a cease-fire for the elections. Let me say, Mr. President, what we need is a cease-fire, period. What we need is a stopping of the killing, and a serving of notice to the

world that we intend to stop the killing of American boys and of Asians, too.

That is why I have been urging—and it is more important now, may I say to my President, after he has announced today his support of some United Nations supervision of elections—that my President go to New York and ask the United Nations to take over the threat completely.

That is the obligation of the United Nations. If the Security Council does not wish to do it, then let my President, as I have said so many times, make a plea to the General Assembly for a cease-fire order, with the pledge of the members of the General Assembly—and that is the responsibility the Charter places upon them—to send over whatever number of men are necessary to enforce a cease-fire. That is quite a different thing from making war, as the United States is making it, in South Vietnam. That is what the President of the United States ought to be asking the United Nations to do—not asking them to supervise the “election” of the government's candidates.

Oh, that will get public attention, and create the false impression in the minds of many that the United States is seeking United Nations intervention. But the test of whether or not the United States is seeking United Nations intervention is whether or not my President and yours will say to the United Nations, “Take over this threat to the peace of the world in southeast Asia.” And nothing less than that carries out my President's responsibilities under the Charter.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a series of the articles in the United Nations Charter of which, in my judgment, the United States has violated by its intervention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The portions of the United Nations Charter ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

CHAPTER I. PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES

Article 1

The Purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;
2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;
3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and
4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

Article 2

The Organization and its Members, in pursuit of the Purposes stated in Article 1, shall act in accordance with the following Principles.

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.
2. All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.
3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.
4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.
5. All Members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.
6. The Organization shall ensure that states which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these Principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.
7. Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII.

CHAPTER VI. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Article 33

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.
2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Article 34

The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 35

1. Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.
2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter.
3. The proceedings of the General Assembly in respect of matters brought to its attention under this Article will be subject to the provisions of Articles 11 and 12.

Article 36

1. The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in Ar-

Article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.

3. In making recommendations under this Article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court.

Article 37

1. Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

Article 38

Without prejudice to the provisions of Articles 33 to 37, the Security Council may, if all the parties to any dispute so request, make recommendations to the parties with a view to a pacific settlement of the dispute.

CHAPTER VII. ACTION WITH RESPECT TO THREATS TO THE PEACE, BREACHES OF THE PEACE, AND ACTS OF AGGRESSION

Article 39

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Article 40

In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided for in Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

Article 41

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Article 42

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

Article 50

If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the

Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

Article 51

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

CHAPTER VIII. REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Article 52

1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes 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, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

2. The Members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

4. This Article in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35.

Article 53

1. The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against any enemy state, as defined in paragraph 2 of this Article, provided for pursuant to Article 107 or in regional arrangements directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of any such state, until such time as the Organization may, on request of the Governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by such a state.

2. The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of this Article applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present Charter.

Article 54

The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in his colloquy with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], mentioned the supervisory role the United Nations has played in the Congo, and in the dispute between Israel and other countries of the Middle East.

I do not know what he means by a supervisory role. The United Nations took over in the Congo. I was one of the representatives of this Government as a delegate in the United Nations when it did. But we had a Secretary-Gen-

eral of the United Nations at that time by the name of Dag Hammarskjöld, who did not engage in evasions with regard to his responsibilities. That courageous Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld, left no room for doubt as to where he thought the United Nations should stand in regard to maintaining the peace of the world in the Congo. But Mr. U Thant has. In my judgment, in so doing he has failed in his responsibilities and obligations as Secretary-General of the United Nations. All his supporters are saying Russia, France, the United States, Great Britain, and the other great powers wish him to remain as Secretary-General. If that be true, I suspect that his over-all do-nothing policy is probably why they want him to remain.

What we must have, if we are to stop this killing in southeast Asia, and the danger of a massive war and more massive killing spreading through Asia and throughout the world, is for the United Nations to proceed to act. Our country ought to put the United Nations on the spot now, by asking them to declare the cease-fire and take action. Anything short of that, may I say, on the part of our President and our Ambassador to the United Nations is failing to carry out what is our clear obligation, in order to preserve peace in the world.

Mr. President, there is such a growing insistence across this country that we change our course of action in southeast Asia that I am greatly encouraged from the reaction of the people of this country. That gives cause for renewed hope because as increasing millions make clearer and clearer to our President that they want this policy changed, I think there is some hope that we will stop slaughtering these American boys and also slaughtering Asians by the course of action we are following in southeast Asia.

But, Mr. President, we can redeem ourselves. We can redeem ourselves by changing our course of action in relationship to the United Nations itself. We can redeem ourselves by our President announcing, as he should be announcing, a cease-fire as far as U.S. operations in South Vietnam are concerned.

When there is this internal turmoil going on in South Vietnam, when there is the situation of South Vietnamese fighting themselves, when the South Vietnamese troops of the junta government devote so much time and effort to suppressing opposition and insurrection in the areas not even controlled by the Vietcong, it is about time that the President gave the assurance to the American people that he is going to stop ordering the killing of American boys in South Vietnam in that inexcusable, immoral, and sinful war.

That is what the American people should demand from the President, because the President can stop the killing of American boys in South Vietnam by issuing an order of cease-fire as far as American troops are concerned. The President can stop the killing of American boys in an escalating war by adopting the recommendation of General Ridgway, General Gavin, George Ken-

June 2, 1966

nan, and others, who point out that we must adopt the enclave strategy in South Vietnam in order to stop increasing hour by hour the serious danger of an all-out massive war in Asia with both China and Russia.

I was interested in the comments of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVIRS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] about the responsibilities and obligations of Russia and Japan. They do have responsibilities and obligations. Both of them have been derelict. But there is another side to that coin, too.

How fortunate the United States and mankind are that Russia has not joined the United States in outlawry in southeast Asia. How fortunate the people of the United States and the people of the world are that Russia thus far has exercised the restraint of not constructing Soviet bases in North Vietnam, not sending Soviet troops in to the assistance of the Vietnamese, not sending in her air power, which we all know would mean world war III if she should start doing it.

If one looks at that side of the coin the sad fact is that Russia has to be given credit for not starting world war III yet. Although she has made very clear her complete disapproval of our policy in Vietnam, although she has given some military aid to the North Vietnamese and to the Vietcong, the fact remains that the restraint of Russia in regard to the Vietnamese situation has prevented the beginning of world war III. How long she will restrain herself I think only God knows. So, it is increasingly important that our country stop risking world war III.

It is saddening to listen to spokesmen of our Government give reassurances to the American people day in and day out that things are looking better in South Vietnam because we are making military progress. We are killing more. We are devastating more. We are despoiling more. We have some of our war hawks, such as Admiral Radford, advocating the mining of Haiphong Harbor and bombing Hanoi, or any point that these militarists suggest. The American militarists are the greatest threat to the peace of the world because it happens to be the American militarists in the service, and some of those retired, such as Admiral Radford or General LeMay, who are advocating our following an even more accelerated course of American outlawry in Asia without a declaration of war and proceeding on an aggressive course of action that, in my judgment, would be bound to bring in Russia.

But these militarists have to be answered and I would like to hear my President answer them for once. Just once.

He spends a lot of time and uses many occasions to answer those who want the war deescalated. But he has no answer, no rebuke, for those in his official family or in his own party, who want the war enlarged. Nor does he care to take issue with the military officers who want to use the situation to exercise their military muscles.

The reason for this distribution of presidential attention is simple: It is limiting and ending the war that has the most appeal to the American public.

I should like to hear the President repudiate the war hawks. In fact, I should like to have my President face up to his obligation under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, and stop making war without a declaration of war. That is a clear obligation of this President of ours to the American people. Let the American people have this war issue clearly drawn. Let the President send a war message to Congress, and let Congress decide whether we want a legal war in the sense that a legal war can be conducted only under a declaration of war. Our constitutional fathers taught us that lesson in the constitutional debates, when they wrote article I, section 8, of the Constitution. They denied to the President the power to wage war without a declaration of war.

The great statesmen from that time on have made that perfectly clear, as have great constitutional scholars. I placed in the Record last Friday an article published in the June issue of the Diplomat, an article written by a man considered by many as the greatest living American historian, but I should say he is among the first three—Henry Commager, of Amherst University.

He not only devastatingly answers the argument of those who claim that the President can make war without a declaration of war, but he devastatingly answers the chain of non sequiturs and policies of Dean Rusk, who tries to justify the killing in Vietnam under SEATO.

Let my President face up to his constitutional duty. Let my President take to the American people a proposal for a declaration of war, as Woodrow Wilson did on the night of April 2, 1917, as I have said in my speeches on the floor of the Senate at least 20 times in the last 3 years, and shall continue to say it, because by repetition, repetition, and repetition, more and more people are beginning to understand.

Woodrow Wilson, on that historic night of April 2, 1917, personally appeared before a joint session of Congress and recommended a declaration of war against the German Imperialist Government. In the first paragraph of that Great War message, President Wilson said there were decisions to be made that it was neither right nor constitutional that he make. He meant the decision of war or peace.

President Wilson did not seek to justify making war against Germany on the basis of the fallacious argument of many Senators, and at the White House, that the President, as Commander in Chief, has the power to respond to the self-defense of the Nation.

Of course he does, but for a very, very limited period of time, and only in order to meet that emergency and get his recommendations and reasons prepared for a declaration of war, and then come before a joint session of Congress and recommend it. That is the limit of the President's so-called power as Commander in Chief to respond to the self-defense needs of the Republic.

No, Mr. President, it is meaningless for the President today to tell the American people that he is for United Nations

supervision of elections in South Vietnam, when those elections will allow no choice among policies and will not cover the whole of the population of Vietnam, because it will eliminate completely one side to the war; namely, the Vietcong.

What kind of elections will they be? Stacked, controlled, and rigged. It is one thing for the President to ask for supervision of those elections by the United Nations, but I ask the President again, "Why do you not call upon the United Nations to declare a cease-fire and declare that we will support a cease-fire."

That is the President's responsibility under the United Nations Charter, as it is the President's responsibility under the Constitution, either to propose a declaration of war or to stop being responsible for the killing of increasing numbers of American boys in South Vietnam.

That is the issue.

Eventually, the American people will determine it.

Mr. President, I made these comments today, not expecting to make them until I heard the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New York, and until I heard about the announcement which is coming out of the White House from our President and our Ambassador to the United Nations.

I say to the American people that the President and Ambassador Goldberg deal with a very superficial phase of this problem. They do not go to the heart of the problem, nor do they carry out the clear responsibility of our President and our Ambassador in the United Nations concerning our obligations to mankind to stop the butchery in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record certain materials, letters, and telegrams which I have received in support of the position I have taken in opposition to the President's war in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DATTON, VA.,
May 31, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I add my thank you to those that are pouring in upon you concerning your courageous stand against the administration's position in Southeast Asia and Vietnam. Please continue your efforts for world peace.

I believe some members of the present administration would do well to remember these words of President Kennedy: "We are not afraid to entrust the American people with unpleasant facts, foreign ideas, alien philosophies and competitive values. For a nation that is afraid to let its people judge the truth and falsehood in an open market is a nation that is afraid of its people."

Yours sincerely,
ELLEN V. SWOPE
Miss Ellen V. Swope.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
May 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my admiration for your courageous stand on the Vietnam war. As a former "colonial" resident of what used to be French Indochina, I feel better qualified than many of

June 2, 1966

our top decision-makers. I wonder often at the nature of their motivation. What drives these people to ignore the facts of the situation? Is it selfish economic interest: there is a perhaps apocryphal story to the effect that when approached at some recent governors' conference about the possibility of seriously trying to end the Vietnam war, Mr. Johnson asked: "Do you want an economic crisis or continued prosperity?" Is it a short-sighted view of our interest in Asia from a military stand-point? Is it because the military are more and more ruling this country, therefore imposing their views on the necessity of war? Is it just pure ignorance, or arrogance as Senator FULBRIGHT put it, or self-delusion in imagining ourselves the rightful, legitimate policemen of the world? If you have no time to answer these questions, can you answer at least this one: how can I, as a responsible (or shall I say too-timorous-to-jump-on-the-barricades) citizen, best help the peace movement? Not being a wild-eyed radical ready to make a lot of noise, or a famous personality who might command a modicum of respect, I feel quite helpless and yet categorically impelled to DO SOMETHING to help steer this country away from the hysterical, jingoist path to senseless destruction?

A very worried American,

JEAN-PAUL DE CHEZET.

BRONX, N.Y.,
May 27, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you with my view on the war against Viet Nam because you have taken a consistent and unequivocal stand in opposition to the war.

During the past few months I have read many newspaper and magazine articles referring to tortures and atrocities committed against prisoners of war and even civilians. I have seen color photographs of prisoners being tortured in magazines such as Life. And on May 23, the New York Times printed a photograph on page 1 of a soldier who had surrendered and was holding his hands above his head, but who was nevertheless shot a few seconds later by one of his captors. Are there no laws of morality left in this country?

Furthermore, I believe that the use of noxious gases by the United States is a violation of the Geneva Protocol of 1925. I believe that it is a crime to use chemical defoliants on the peoples' crops. I think the dropping of napalm bombs will bring unending shame to this country.

I strongly suspect that what the administration describes as the bombing of strategic military targets is, in fact, in many cases the bombing of innocent civilians. I view with horror the photographs I have seen of our soldiers burning whole villages and leaving only desolation for the impoverished peasants. As a citizen I must speak out against what I believe is wrong and what I have seen of this war convinces me that my country is wrong.

The situation is not entirely hopeless as long as there are men with your courage to remind the administration that what it is doing is immoral and evil. I want to tell you how much I appreciate the show of bravery you have made in speaking out against a president who does not welcome opposing views. I hope you will continue your necessary work until we see some indication that our leaders are more concerned with the practice of democracy than with the winning of military victories. History will record that at least one brave man was heard in the Congress at a time when the United States made a terrible mistake.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. COOKE.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,
May 23, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I cannot tell you what it means to me to have a spokesman in the Senate who keeps pounding away at the injustice of the Vietnam conflict. Today we are fighting the Buddhists, the Viet Cong, and the North Vietnamese. One wonders who is with us.

In addition to my horror at our participation in this war as a country, I have the problem of two sons who oppose our action there. The older, aged twenty, is a junior at the University of California at Berkeley. He has affiliated with groups opposing the war, but does not believe in militant opposition, sit-ins, or support of communistic organizations which oppose the war. Like me, the boys believe that if we had the support of the people in that country and could really stop communist aggression in the Far East, the war would make some sense.

We are almost overwhelmed with the futility of protest. We are disheartened at the punishment dealt out to young men who refuse to serve in the armed services while such a war is in progress.

This older son, Richard, will not return to College next semester. He cannot sign up as a conscientious objector as he is not a pacifist and would fight to protect his country or to protect other countries where the people support our participation.

He will not join the armed services under the non-combat provision as he will not promote an unjust war in any way. He would allow himself to be drafted and trained if not made to serve where the conflict is unjust, but we understand that draftees have no choice.

We have read of other young men who have tried to act with integrity under the same circumstances. One is serving a four year prison term and was fined \$10,000. In our own city, a fine young man has been sent to jail more than once for refusing to serve. This seems like double jeopardy.

Richard is convinced that he will be jailed in defense of his principles. He is discouraged of course. I told him that there might be a possibility that he would not be jailed and that he should make some plans. He replied that he could not do so as his plans might become so appealing to him and imprisonment so hard to take in comparison that he would sacrifice his ideals.

It is a heartbreaking decision and he has made it. The younger boy graduates from high school now and will be in college and able to avoid the issue for a while. The thought of our older son in jail is almost too much to bear. If I had my children to raise over again, I think that I might raise them to be tough and unfeeling. They were taught ethics and kindness from the start. Logical thought and sensitivity seem out of place in modern society. Do you have any suggestions?

Whether you answer or not, once again, my heartfelt appreciation for your courageous stand.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. C. WILKINS.

HILLSBORO, KANS.,
May 26, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have watched your courageous and noble service in the Senate for some time. Your firm position and that of a few others has challenged and encouraged me to stand up to the apathy, ignorance, and prejudice surrounding a small minority in Kansas.

I have read your "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam." It is so clear that we

are violating Constitutional and international laws by being in Vietnam. It's such a let-down to know that decency and intelligence and justice have been replaced by the craven and mean. That makes your leadership in Washington all the more important. I hope God spares you until the light of truth breaks over the American people.

The defeat of your Oregon candidate was deeply disappointing.

I thank you sincerely for your untiring fight in trying to save our nation. I hope we have not gone too far at this point and that our "cup is full".

Very Sincerely,

Mrs. D. P. EWERT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

May 24, 1966.

DEAR SIR: Just these few words to thank you for your splendid efforts in the cause of peace. Almost without exception everyone that I know and talk to is behind your courageous crusade. If ever there is a sequel to President Kennedy's Profiles in Courage you are sure to head the list.

Respectfully,

DON DEVLIN.

TOLEDO, OHIO,

May 28, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this on my way to Columbus to hear Senator GRUENING and to take part in a march on the State House.

I think every democrat should contribute to Gov. Hatfield's campaign and thus follow your lead in supporting him. My son is returning from Somalia after serving two years in the Peace Corps. He graduated from the University of Oregon and is an Oregon voter. He is very enthused by your leadership and sees the real work of the present generation as educating, helping & succoring rather than in destroying.

Our movement is growing. There was no Toledo Committee for a Reasonable Settlement last November. There are 300 members with hundreds of others we have not "been involved positively" yet. We are very much encouraged but we have no hope that the President will listen until forced to politically.

Sincerely yours,

E. JANE JOHNSON.

FULLERTON, CALIF.,

May 25, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

SIR: Excuse the pencil please, since I feel it is no time to hunt for a pen. I support your position on Vietnam. And feel that the Administration is totally wrong. Which is beside the point I am about to make. And that is that—we should call for a constitutional amendment which would put a moratorium on all profits—in regards to war appropriations, or defense spending by the Government. I am aware that the implications of this constitutional amendment are far reaching. However I believe that to call for such an amendment at this time in history, will have far reaching repercussions and get at the root of the contradictions of the administration. They profess to seek no wider war—so let them put their profits where there mouth is.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE S. DEMILT.

Hooray for Peace!

DETROIT LAKES, MINN.,

May 27, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue your efforts to get us out of Viet Nam.

Many thanks for your efforts.

Sincerely,

DON LYNCH.

June 2, 1966

BELLEVUE, WASH.,
May 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish merely to express my appreciation for your continued courageous efforts to critically assess our role and policies in Viet-Nam. In wishing you success I am not only expressing my hope that an erroneous and immoral foreign policy may be terminated, but also that the reasonable expression of disagreement and dissatisfaction with handling of specific affairs by the administration may retain an honored place in our society.

Sincerely yours,

GERALD J. OPPENHEIMER.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,
May 25, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a Californian I cannot cast my ballot for you and thereby express my faith and belief in your stand against the Vietnam war which you are taking. Therefore, as a citizen of the United States, I would like to offer you my utmost gratitude and sincere support of your policies and of your work in which you are now engaged. I am convinced that we need more leaders such as you in our Senate and wholeheartedly wish you every success. It is my fervent hope that more and more persons will adhere to your concepts.

Yours truly,

PHYLLIS KANTER
(Mrs. Joseph Kanter).

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
May 26, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have recently read with great care your statement to the Senate in the Congressional Record of March 17, 1966 which was kindly forwarded to me by Mr. Sig Rosenblum of New York City. Since the statement was made, the situation in Vietnam has only deteriorated further. I thoroughly agree that in respect to foreign policy our President and politicians have betrayed and failed us.

What seems to me to be equally frustrating is that even through the ballot there appears to be so little the public can do to alter the situation. The candidates for public office, on the whole, seem to prefer to vie with one another in display of their "patriotism" and support of administration policies rather than to take a position based on morality and, in this case, common sense. The sad truth that the administration has failed to realize is that dishonesty and immorality in national policy abroad is generating similar degeneracy here at home. For this, I fear, history will judge the present administration harshly. I am proud of your stand and outspoken criticism and wish to express my support of your position.

Sincerely yours,

SEYMOUR KESSLER.

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA.,
May 27, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Having watched the Senate hearings on television and the positive position you and Senator FULBRIGHT have taken on the Vietnam fiasco, even though not popular with the executive branch of our government—I wish to congratulate you and ask that you continue to press for a complete withdrawal of the flower of our nation from this rat-hole which is draining the manpower of our nation.

It is about time that the legislative branch of government recognize their responsibilities to the electorate and withhold from the President the privilege of sending abroad our youth to die on foreign soil without our nation being wantonly attacked beforehand.

Here, we send 250,000 men and billions of dollars to fight a war we cannot win, just as we did in Korea and yet a Communist pipsqueak—Fidel Castro defies us successfully just 80 miles off our shoreline.

My wife and I are the parents of 5 boys and girls (now parents themselves) who were involved in two previous wars and we are sick and tired of American involvement in the political wars of other nations. Everyone of us would defend our shoreline with every drop of blood we possess but not one drop to defend foreign religious and political factions, in their internal disputes.

I believe our views are those of the majority of Americans who have felt the pangs of war and see nothing but tragedy ahead in the present policy of U.S.A. involvement in every part of the world.

We have a responsibility to those unborn to leave to them a nation—free from bankruptcy and a national debt they cannot possibly pay off. If Congress would enact taxation to cover the cost of wars as they are being waged—there would be such a clamor from the American people to end the conflict immediately—the administration would be forced to act accordingly.

Keep up the good work—you are truly a patriotic Senator—despite the opinion of the opposition.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR R. ROBINSON.

KERRVILLE, TEX.,
May 25, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for your efforts to get our boys out of Viet Nam. I wish we had 98 more Senators like you and Senator Fulbright.

We have nothing to gain in Viet Nam, and much to lose. It is one of the most useless, idiotic, and brutal wars in the history of the world.

I value the life of just one American boy far more than all Viet Nam. And think of the billions of dollars of taxpayers' money that is being wasted!

More power to you. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND ORR,
A Grassroot Taxpayer.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
May 22, 1966.

Mr. L. B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I want you to know you have lost two ardent supporters and two votes in the next election. We have great sympathy for the Buddhists and great disdain for your clumsy Vietnam involvement.

You can be sure we will vote against any public official who supports this bloodthirsty and highly dangerous "policy".

Sincerely,

LOURENE M. BOYER.
RONALD S. BOYER

(Copy to: J. W. FULBRIGHT, WAYNE MORSE.)
Keep up the good work!

BALTIMORE, MD.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your courageous stand on Vietnam. It is only through a very limited number of voices that the public at large becomes aware of many is-

suess that might otherwise be unknown to them by miasma of silence.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. JOSEPH BAYLUS.

MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIF.,
May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a fellow lawyer I feel proud that you are a member of that profession.

To hear the A.B.A. speak of "Rule of Law" and to see what our government is doing to it with our action in Vietnam is a travesty.

Keep up the hard work.

Sincerely,

DARBY N. SILVERBERG.

cc: President Johnson.

WILTON MONTHLY MEETING OF THE
RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,
Wilton, Conn., May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We would like to call your attention to the enclosed copy of an advertisement placed recently by the Wilton Friends Meeting to express support of the traditional Quaker stand against violence of any kind.

Though this is a well-known statement of the position of Quakers, we feel there is a particular necessity for its re-emphasis today.

We appreciate the courageous stand you have taken in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MISS MARGARET A. PICKETT,
Chairman, Peace and Service Committee.

[From the Wilton monthly meeting of the
Religious Society of Friends]

A QUAKER STATEMENT ABOUT WAR

Today, in these troubled times, we would like to share the following messages with our neighbors:

A declaration from the harmless and innocent people of God, called Quakers, presented to Charles II, 1660.

We utterly deny all outward wars and strife, and fightings with outward weapons, for any end, or under any pretense whatsoever; this is our testimony to the whole world. The Spirit of Christ, by which we are guided, is not changeable, so as once to command us from a thing as evil, and again to move unto it; and we certainly know, and testify to the world, that Spirit of Christ, which leads us into all truth, will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the Kingdom of Christ, nor for the kingdoms of the world . . . Therefore, we cannot learn war any more.

The Wilton Peace Minute, from Wilton monthly meeting to Friends everywhere, 1960.

It is now 300 years since Friends first declared "we cannot learn war any more." Now as then, the spirit of Jesus Christ can never move us to violence, neither in personal conflict nor in public life. His way leads only to peace with all men. His way is opened by that of God in every man; and by the helping hand of God available to all. Today, His way can save the world. Though every individual owes loyalty to the state, he owes higher loyalty to the inner light that is of God. And so with special urgency we invite all who hear to utterly renounce war—now the real and final enemy of man—and daily to seek ways to practice the life that knows no occasion for war, and to learn the ways of peace without which all men perish.

Friends, like so many others, believe that war brings only misery. War does not—and never has—led to permanent achievement of freedom, justice and security. Even when

June 2, 1966

the issue is righteous and conflict seems justified there are higher and more effective ways than violence to oppose evil. War begets only war.

Friends have found, by long experiment, that suspicion, distrust, fear, and violence itself, are healed only by the reconciling power of love.

We urge all men and women whose hearts are sickened by the suffering of war victims to join us in prayer and constructive work for peace.

(Wilton Friends Meeting, 317 New Canaan Avenue, Wilton, Conn., by George S. Hastings, clerk.)

READING, PA.,
May 26, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for waging such a vigorous and dynamic campaign in the furtherance of the interest of peace in this world. It is encouraging indeed to see men of such original American independence and such courageous undaunted faith "stand up" and proclaim the truth to the American people.

There are, indeed, many things of questionable character in the conduct of the war in Viet Nam—about this there seems to be little question indeed in the minds of most all of your fellow Americans. There is undoubtedly great restiveness pervading the American people at the present time, and Viet Nam and the many undesirable things occurring there are one of the greatest topics of discussion of the present time and the American people are crying out in anguish against the present conduct of affairs relating to the Viet Nam situation.

All these distorted views, etc., presented by the advocates of further involvement and further advocates of carnage and radicalism, bespeak not of a free structure—but invariably are closely synonymous with the very dictatorial ideals against which we free people in America have so long been in opposition.

You have presented a true challenge to the entire problem and have truthfully attempted to expose that which needs exposure, and your attempt at truthfulness is most certainly deeply appreciated both by your constituents as well as by grave men everywhere.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. DEININGER.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
May 28, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just finished reading excerpts from your speech on The President and Vietnam, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1966 and I want to extend my congratulations.

I feel that the American people are extremely fortunate to have a Senator, like yourself, who is courageous enough to speak out against the President and this Administration who listen only to the voices of the Hawks, constantly tells us how hard they are working for Peace yet continues to escalate our troops in Vietnam, and gives whole-hearted support to General Ky.

I worked hard to get President Johnson elected because Mr. Goldwater continually talked war during the campaign, while Mr. Johnson assured us that if he were elected there would be no war. Since the President was not honest during his campaign, I don't believe him now when I hear him say he is working day and night for a peaceful solution to end the war. I agree fully with you when you say "the President must be stopped

with ballots, for it is the only way left to stop his bullets".

Already, I am being urged to vote for this man and that man in the coming State elections. I have resolved to find out from each candidate whom I might be interested in, how he stands on the Vietnam issue. If he supports the President and the Administration, he loses my support. For the first time in the many years that I have been voting the Democratic ticket, the coming elections might prove the exception, and it is even possible that for the first time I will have to forego my vote if there is no difference in the candidates positions. I can assure you that my vote will not send to Congress any man or women who will rubber-stamp the President in carrying on this Vietnamese disaster.

Thank you for again speaking-out and sharing your feelings and your ideas with the American people.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY E. MARBLE.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
May 26, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We support your opposition to President Johnson's disastrous Vietnam policies.

Note the attached letter to President Johnson.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN B. DYKSTRA.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
May 26, 1966.

President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: You may feel that the Oregon primary was a victory for you and an endorsement of your policies. However in California, among my friends (most of whom voted for you in opposition to Goldwater in 1964), I know of none who will vote for you again in view of your disastrous Vietnam policies.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. DYKSTRA.

cc: Senator FULBRIGHT, Senator MORSE.

WORTHINGTON, OHIO,
May 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should have written much sooner about this, but I heard you on the open debate with Rusk concerning the American policy in Vietnam. I want to commend you on your stand. I am sure you made at least a few listeners have second thoughts about our position there.

Thank you for all you have done to challenge the administration's policies. Keep up the good work—I am behind you all the way.

Sincerely,

SUE ROBINSON.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,
May 25, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Let me offer you my praise and support of your stand in the Senate on Vietnam and other issues our country is floundering with.

I admire the courage it must take to take the stand you have in the face of such opposition with which you are meeting. I say this as a former Oregonian and as a staunch and loyal citizen of our country.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH KANTER, D.M.D.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the good fight to get our boys out of Viet Nam. We are with you and your views 100 percent.

This can be accomplished and be done gracefully without losing face and our boys.

Mrs. MARGARET NESBITT.

ST. CLOUD, FLA.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter from 60 Junior College Instructors and Administrators of Sacramento to President Johnson. We want you to know that the example you are setting in Washington is being followed in Sacramento and that people here are voicing their disapproval of the administration's policies in Vietnam.

We praise you for your forthright stand on this controversial issue and we urge you to continue voicing your opposition to the administration's policies in Vietnam.

Charles Myers, Stanley Jerome, Robert Bester, Philip Onstott, Clifton Gordon, Larry Weiden, Marvin W. Cragun, Norman Thornburg, Albert Byrd, Clifford Curtice, Dorka Bohr, Sam Kipp, Darrel Forney, Robert J. Bader, Fred Ittner, Duncan Courvoisier, Jack Fiedler, Tom Schmidt, Harry Cole, Will Solomon.

Richard Miller, Lloyd Bruno, Ray Harker, Charles Nadler, Patricia McHugh, Ritchie Thomas, Richard Shimasaki, Al Kwolek, Edgar Meyer, Marla Brugge, Gene Tarr, Charles Slater, Muriel Foliansbee, John Miller, Eugene Volz, William McCrory, Betty Robinson, Hal McMurrough, Guilbert DuMont, Steve Stremmel.

Walter Kaufmann, Nona M. Anderson, Larry Malmgren, Margaret Harrison, Fred Schmid, Fred Milstein, John Valone, Paul Gould, Frank E. Bush, George Anastasiow, William Mariano, Willard L. Melton, Allan Bravitz, Clive Mefford, Albert Wuesthoff, Paul Lorch, Donald Jewell, Leo McCauley, Byron Patterson, Joseph F. Martin, Junior College Instructors & Administrators of Sacramento.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
March 22, 1966.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON: For nearly twelve years the United States has been pursuing a course of improvised disaster in Vietnam. The time has now come for concerned citizens to protest the apparent hypocrisy of their government.

We claim to be in Vietnam at the invitation of a beleaguered government, but that government, like its sixteen predecessors since 1954, is our creature, and could not have been established, nor could it long survive without American force.

We claim to desire self-determination for the Vietnamese people, but this claim hardly has the ring of truth, since the war is a result of our refusal to allow the elections stipulated by the Geneva Accords of 1954.

We claim to desire no bases in Vietnam, but the bases are being built.

We claim to desire a negotiated peace, but we have steadfastly refused to negotiate with the people whom we are fighting—the National Liberation Front.

We claim to fear Chinese aggressiveness, when the presence of 235,000 American soldiers in Vietnam would suggest that we might more reasonably fear our own.

We claim to be in Vietnam to protect the Vietnamese from aggression, but our use of toxic chemicals, napalm and torture, and the large numbers of non-combatant dead indicate that the South Vietnamese need protection from their friends rather than their "enemies."

June 2, 1966

It is, thus, abundantly clear that American acts in Vietnam are totally inconsistent with the lofty aims which we claim to pursue. We, therefore, vehemently urge that the government take such steps as are necessary to extricate the United States from what can only become an increasingly cynical and increasingly hazardous attempt to pursue American interests at the expense of the suffering people of Vietnam.

PHOENIX, OREG.,
May 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed clippings were printed in today's Oregonian. They reflect the growing concern of Oregonians and of the whole nation about the Vietnam war. Most of them express their confidence in you that you so richly deserve.

I hope that in reading these you will find renewed faith in the voting public and renewed vigor in your battle to present the facts about the other side of the Vietnam war.

I am a college student who opposes a war that is unconstitutional, to begin with, but is also stupid, cruel and wasteful of lives and educational (etc.) monies.

Most of the people I talk to at college are in support of you, Senator Morse. Though we are silent, shy to write letters and reluctant to start calling names. I am sure you realize that we admire and respect what you are doing. The Senators KENNEDY and FULBRIGHT, Dr. Benjamin Spock, and the countless educators, clergymen and citizens who agree with you about Vietnam think of you as an honest and most courageous man.

In short, continue your fight. As these clippings show, there is a growing number of citizens who support you to the hilt.

Sincerely,

MAY LYNN MORRISON.

To the Editor:

My Voter's Pamphlet states that Robert Duncan "firmly supports our nation's policy of resisting Communist aggression without becoming involved in a nuclear third world war."

Political hogwash. Who of us wants nuclear war? But, we are heading in that direction faster than most of us realize. Our nation's policy? If the United States has a defensible policy for Americans killing Asians (on their own soil) and vice versa, I have yet to hear of it.

Can Mr. Rusk or Mr. Duncan tell us how American fighting men can distinguish a Viet Cong man from a South Vietnamese? Press pictures show both to be undernourished and childish looking.

Two warring factions never filled anybody's empty belly. If these people feel a Viet Cong victory will benefit their wretched condition, can we blame them for fighting the opposition? No matter which faction wins the poor will be as wretched as before.

JEWELL ETHEL RICE.

TILLAMOOK.

To the Editor:

Why do you depict Senators MORSE and FULBRIGHT as hooded Klansmen? Why do you belittle these men?

It is not they whom you are trying to silence, it is the millions of people in the United States who dare to question our overbearing, militaristic foreign policy.

You are shutting off debate by making Viet Nam opposition unpatriotic (unpopular). Only those with independent financial means can afford to speak out in opposition. We used to refer to these tactics as "dirty pool".

Why must good men like Senators MORSE and FULBRIGHT be persecuted? They are the best Americans of all.

GEORGE JOHNSON.

EUGENE.

To the Editor:

Johnson's claim that the use of power involves agony reminds one of the parent who insists to his child, "This hurts me worse than it hurts you," and then proceeds to lay on the club. Such an excuse for violence is disgusting in a parent and it is equally disgusting in a President.

Of course, it could be that the agony results from his conscience. If that is the case, let him make some genuine effort to end this brutal war against the Asian people and to bring home the brave and innocent young Americans whose lives are being wasted on a cause that is not only hopeless but unjust.

BYRON L. HAINES.

To the Editor:

Your calling the Foreign Relations Committee's hearings a "sickening show" proves that there is none so blind as those that will not see. Correct your myopic vision and take a good look at Viet Nam if you are to see a real sick and insane drama being enacted. Our only hope in getting the curtain down on this sad and infamous spectacle is by honorable and courageous men such as Senators MORSE and FULBRIGHT.

I sincerely feel sorry for Secretary Rusk as he hopelessly tries to justify this comedy of errors by repetitiously parroting these words: "We are in Viet Nam at the request of the South Vietnamese government." My greatest concern though is for the 250,000 of our young men over there who cannot help but wonder which, if any, government they are jeopardizing their lives for.

I believe the people of Oregon are the most intelligent electorate in the nation and will never send a senator or representative to Washington again who will permit such a small group in government to precipitate such a crisis as Viet Nam without questioning every ramification that it may create. We are fortunate to have such choices in men such as Howard Morgan, Mark Hatfield and Charles Porter.

EDWARD H. GEISSLER.

SPRINGFIELD.

To the Editor:

As I hear the reports and see the pictures of the people being killed in Viet Nam it just doesn't seem to make sense to me. It does not somehow seem right that the most powerful nation on earth should be sending the mightiest sea, air and artillery power against such small, desperately poor people, many of whom are utterly illiterate and ignorant of the so-called civilized world.

Why shouldn't we let them alone, or let them all vote—north and south—as planned in the Geneva Convention of 1954? We say they are Communist, but the Japanese photographer who interviewed the second in command, who some say is more powerful than Ho Chi Minh, says he is not Communist at all but "economic socialist."

But supposing he is Communist. We are not shooting and killing the 40 per cent in Italy who voted Communist, nor the Communists or economic socialists in France, in the Scandinavian countries, nor in India, China, Russia, Albania, etc. The slaughter of these wretched Orientals seems especially wrong to me, as a Christian.

To love a child—and as I see these people they are as ignorant little children—we must not spoil them, no. But to bomb their bridges, highways, power plants, railways, to kill them in such numbers with the greatest air and sea power, napalm, mortar fire of the

most advanced nation on earth, just does not feel to me to be in accord with the will of God. There must be a better way.

GERALD G. EMERSON,
Pastor.

NEWBERG First Presbyterian Church,
Newberg.

PEACE WITH HONOR

To the Editor:

ROBERT DUNCAN's position is firm support of Mr. Johnson's present Viet policy, including the refusal to negotiate with the Viet Cong. But this refusal rules out meaningful negotiations and makes our present policy, with its repeated escalations of the war, a policy which in fact seeks a military solution of the problem in Viet Nam. Pursuit of this policy of military victory will require increasing commitments of U.S. troops due to the stepped-up infiltration of regular Viet troops from the north and to the steady deterioration of the South Viet army as an effective fighting force (it had 100,000 desertions last year). It is hard to believe that China will not be forced eventually to enter this conflict. (Imagine our reaction if the Chinese were fighting a war in Mexico or Guatemala, 250,000 troops on the ground, Chinese planes occasionally straying across the U.S. border.)

One could agree with Mr. DUNCAN's desire to contain Chinese power and influence, and yet insist that U.S. involvement in a massive land war in Asia will defeat that purpose. Howard Morgan has made clear his opposition to the present policy of seeking a military solution to what is essentially a political problem. He insists that both U.S. and Vietnamese interests will best be served by establishment of a politically independent Viet Nam government. To promote a climate conducive to political reconstruction, Morgan would de-escalate both the air and ground war, and agree to include all belligerents in negotiations. To this reader, Morgan's Viet policies offer the best chance for the U.S. disengaging itself honorably from a hopeless military conflict in Asia.

JOHN L. HAMMOND.

RICHMOND, VA.,
May 26, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to tell you that I am back of you in all you are saying and doing to try to stop this sacrifice of young Americans in that sea of human corruption that is Viet Nam.

One of the things I have to teach my class is the psychology of leadership. They study that there are three types of leadership:

Authoritarian
Laissez-faire
Democratic

We are now testing which type we, indeed, have in the United States. Surely if it is democratic, as we hope and pray it is, voices like mine all over the country will be heard.

I am a patriotic American whose family has been in all of the wars in which the United States has taken part, and one member lies buried in Arlington. I am a conservative,—not a pacifist, and it goes without saying—not a Communist. This war in Viet Nam is, to my mind, aiding the Communists for it is capable of wearing us out (as one of the steps of Lenin foretold). The corruption on ALL sides there makes our participation a form of mass insanity.

May your efforts succeed in awakening the American people and arousing them to action that will be listened to by those in high places.

Sincerely yours,
DR. PORTIA HAMILTON.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 2, 1966

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hurrah for the courage you show. I could say many things but you know it all and would be a waste of time for both of us. My children know of no young men who have any desire to fight in Viet-Nam. One young man we know has served in Santo Domingo as a Para-trooper. He would have stayed in the service and made it his career, but he did not wish to risk being sent to another hole such as Viet-Nam. It isn't a lack of patriotism as they are willing to defend and fight for our country but to go where we're despised and not wanted.

Every war we fight, the common man hears it rumored that we are fighting for the rich business men who have holdings of some kind in these countries, but of course will never sure as patriotism as the lack of it is always pushed down our throats. I've often heard it said if these 40 to 50 year old men had to go to fight the wars there wouldn't be any.

Thank you.
Sincerely

OTTAWA, ILL.

Mrs. DON McLACHLAN.

MAY 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been listening to your speeches and hope you keep up the good work. I just can't think that anything in south east Asia is worth one of our boys' lives. I believe we should help the people in our own country to vote, to get jobs and decent wages and houses to live in. There are more people than you realize that agree with your views. Most mothers of boys sure do and I hope that we get out of this terrible war.

Sincerely

Mrs. H. J. FRAHM.

Senator MORSE: I thought I'd take time out from studies to applaud your stand on our Vietnam policy. I'm sorry to hear that they don't heed yours and Senator FULBRIGHT's warnings (recent boost in our troop commitment). Perhaps history will remember that there were a few sane "peace-niks" attempting to stop the flow of world blood. However, history has been kindest to the war mongers, both "good and bad" if such a significance is possible.

I have found that those people who support the war, support it for the wrong reasons. I've never had the privilege of carrying a sign—frankly I've been too busy with studies—however, I'd rather be labeled a "beatnik" than a "warrior." A revolution or insurgency must have the support of the people and after twenty years it would seem logical that we might get the hint. The ugly American is on stage again, taking another bow. Please, sir, make yourself heard.

With sincere appreciation,
TIMOTHY B. McGRATH.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
May 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: What a great service to all the people, you are in the Senate. To the American people, world's people and the people of Viet Nam. For it is upon your success rests their fragile fate.

I often wonder how the Nazis would have fared if someone had taken them on the way you have. I can understand why they call you the "Tiger of the Senate."

I am doing what I can on my level to help get us out of the war.

It is a pleasure to be living in your generation. Please send me any facts or speeches which would be helpful in the fight.

Sincerely,

GEORGE DOBBINS.

TORONTO, ONTARIO,
May 24, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate, Washington, D.C., United States.

DEAR SIR: I am an American voter living in Canada. I am a student and a teaching fellow at the University of Toronto. I would like to add my voice to yours in protest of President Johnson's policy in Vietnam. Alone I feel helpless in the face of the President's arrogant refusal to recognize criticism. My first letter to the President went unacknowledged. My second letter was forwarded to the American Consulate in Toronto. The Consul sent me a letter explaining that he appreciated my concern and that the President was also concerned.

I am more than concerned. I am angry. I feel betrayed by the President's actions. His actions are inconsistent with his campaign promises. I feel frightened that one man can possess so much power in a democracy. I think that Mr. Johnson has transgressed his legal power as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces. His refusal to recognize criticism is an arrogant misuse of power. His name calling is beneath the dignity of the office of the Presidency. I am not a "nervous nelly" and I hope you point this out to the President of "all the people."

Sincerely yours,

HAL BURNHAM.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for sending me the material concerning the U.S. position in Vietnam. I sincerely agree with the lawyers' Committee and am passing around the record among friends. I shall certainly refuse to vote for anyone who will not promise to work for speedy withdrawal from Vietnam and cessation of this immoral and illegal war. Keep up the good work!

ESTHER VANCE.

McHENRY, ILL.,
May 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Please continue in your efforts to halt this mess in Viet Nam. Are we going to be fighting the Viet Cong, the North Vietnamese, and the South Vietnamese? Who is going to be left in that poor mutilated country to help us win their(?) war for freedom (and ours for their natural resources)???

From a grateful American family who deeply appreciate your convictions and pray for your continuing strength to fight for them.

Sincerely,

BRUNO C. and MARGARET KARAS.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator, Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR: Keep up the good work and get our boys out of Viet Nam. Don't give up the fight, we're with you.

Mrs. MARGARET NESEIT.

ST. CLOUD, FLA.

PARK FOREST, ILL.,
May 25, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I thank you for your fine television appearances. I appreciate more than words can say your views on the Vietnam War. Your words, "We have the right to dissent" made me feel America still has some of the real spirit left of its original founders. I have one son in the service and another of the draft age. Should this war be furthered who knows about another son who will be a freshman this fall. Thank you for all of

your efforts to end this war. You say so eloquently all the words I think and feel to be true.

Yours truly,

Mrs. DONALD H. ALESHIRE.

GREENVILLE, OHIO,
May 24, 1966.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to compliment you for the conscience and fortitude you displayed during the Senate Committee hearing (televised the evening of May 11) when Mr. McNamara was interrogated. I deeply appreciate the disturbance that you, Mr. FULBRIGHT and others are making at this time.

There are "computer men" who walk among us as humans. (Are they reproducing? Heaven forbid!)

Mr. McNamara's case is one of mistaken identity. He thought he could charge through like a knight of old, armed with a computer, and the war would be won by precision. Now he continues to face his adversary because he is afraid to turn his back and run.

A "simple-minded" solution for the war is this: retreat and make "enclaves" and then evacuate all who wish to leave. This would be more soulful than war, and certainly more economical of everything, even if it took more than a year to accomplish it.

Here is a quote I think pertinent in this situation: " * * * it is not America but Russia, holding vast lands once belonging to the Middle Kingdom, who has most to fear a clash with an aggressive China."

Sincerely,

Mrs. T. K. WENRICK.

NEWBURGH, N.Y.,
May 25, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you to thank you for your criticism of our administration's stand in Viet Nam.

So many of us feel strongly that we do not have the moral right to be there but it is like a voice crying in the wilderness. Our objections do not seem to be listened to and with each passing day, more of our young men are being killed. How very tragic for the families involved. How can people bear the loss of loved ones for a reason in which they cannot believe.

I pray that you will continue voicing your opposition.

Sincerely,

MARION W. RIDER
Mrs. M. J. Rider.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
May 23, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I'm not a pacifist but I'm shocked to the Vietnam situation. How could we get so involved? I can't believe it. It's a nightmare to most of us.

It must be worse than a nightmare to the average Vietnamese. No wonder we're unpopular. The only people who seem to want us to stay are the profiteers and the Ky government.

Thank you for having the courage to express your opinions. I'm sure most Americans agree with you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ETHEL I. EDING.

COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA,
May 24, 1966.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my disapproval of the war in Viet Nam. Our boys are being killed a few at a time and this war could go on for years and years. Most of the people don't feel this war unless

June 2, 1966

they have boys in the service. I have two sons in the service and it seems to me that Robert S. McNamara is trying to prolong this war at the expense of the lives of our boys.

I have read in our paper where our boys have been cut short on materials, and weapons. We seem to be short of planes and bombs.

What is our commitment to this country? They have no form of government. Are our boys dying for nothing? If our boys die one at a time what will this solve in this country?

This war is not ours, this is needless bloodshed and loss of our boys lives. Each and every boy is precious to their families. They deserve the chance to live and have families of their own.

I have heard your views on Viet Nam and I hope you know that most of the people that I know share your views. Help us to stop this needless slaughter of our boys. Surely there is another way to help these people without the needless death of our boys. If this war is necessary then we should not hold back on the bombs. Bomb the strategic places like Hanoi.

Sincerely

Mrs. HELEN L. GREENE.

FLUSHING, N.Y., May 26, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Attached is a letter we wrote to President Johnson protesting our involvement in the war in Vietnam. We would like you to know we support your courageous stand against the War in the Senate and on the Foreign Relations Committee. We believe you are helping democracy to survive in this country at a time when it is being seriously challenged by the actions of the President and his Administration.

We urge you to continue to bring the truth about the War to the American people in the face of all opposition from the White House because we believe that the people are beginning to realize the illegality, brutality, and shamefulness of this destructive policy which has not advanced our country's ideals at all in Vietnam or the rest of the world.

Very truly yours,

LARRY FANTL.
SUSAN FANTL.

FLUSHING, N.Y., May 24, 1966.

"President JOHNSON,
"White House,
"Washington, D.C.

"DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: We would like to register our opposition as citizens of the United States and as human beings, to this country's role in the present conflicts in Viet Nam. We oppose our open support of the military, anti-constitutional government of General Ky against the National Liberation Front, and our tacit, indirect support of Ky against the Buddhists who are seeking constitutional government. (Ky could not combat the Buddhists so successfully without the military equipment provided him by the U.S. Government.)

"The brutal war we are waging against the National Liberation Front (NLF) and North Viet Nam (we make a distinction) are morally and legally wrong, and diplomatically and tactically damaging this country's domestic programs and international bargaining position and prestige.

"1. More Americans are now being killed than Vietnamese. We have been fighting for at least two years with no concrete military victories ever being achieved and maintained. Obviously a military victory in Viet Nam is impossible. Obviously the bulk of the Vietnamese population is either positively supporting the NLF, or else not enough opposed to it to actively work for the Ky government.

In any case, we have created a situation in which Ky's government is as much hated as the NLF by anti-communists like the Buddhists, which comprise a majority of the nation's population.

"2. We are provoking Communist China by repeated bombings of North Viet Nam, closer and closer to the Chinese border. This does not even take into account the fact that these bombings have not brought us military victory. We must consider also the crudity and illegality of bombing North Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, which have never been proven indispensable and sole sustainers of the NLF in South Vietnam.

"3. We are retarding relations with Russia and with France, a potential friend and a former one, by persisting in these aggressive actions in S.E. Asia.

"4. The war has retarded social progress domestically, holding back the two primary programs of your administration, the Poverty Program and the Civil Rights Program.

"5. By escalating the war and by bombing North Vietnam, you have betrayed the voters who elected you instead of Barry Goldwater because you supposedly stood for fair-minded political action and a minimum of military action in South Vietnam.

"6. You have betrayed the voters who favored your liberal and humanitarian program of social legislation at home. To us, it is the nation's disgrace that Medicare and the Civil Rights Act, and the War on Poverty, should be accompanied by a war on Vietnam which obliterates human rights, increases poverty and suffering. The acts at home are constructive and laudable, and will give your administration an honored place in this nation's history for generations. But the acts of war abroad have already made your name and administration infamous to many, and the damage done to our national reputation, to the U.N., to international diplomatic relations in Europe as well as Asia, and to the Vietnamese people will take as many generations to rectify.

"We support the statements of Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, and KENNEDY, and all others who have spoken out against the War. We ask:

"1. That you cease immediately the bombing of North Vietnam.

"2. That you initiate no more attacks on the NLF in the South.

"3. That you hinge your military support of Ky on his guarantees of elections September 12, and his promise not to destroy the Buddhist movement which opposes him. (CONTROL KY, DON'T LET HIM CONTROL OUR FOREIGN POLICY)

"4. That you reconvene the Geneva Conference and reinstate the U.N. to provide suggestions whenever it feels it can.

"5. That you offer to negotiate immediately and unconditionally with NLF as a major party of all discussions.

"6. That you campaign for peace, not as you did last January with accompanying escalations of the number of troops in Vietnam, etc., but honorably and sincerely, and for as long as it takes to reach a peaceful, satisfactory political settlement.

"As things stand, Mr. President, we have discovered that it is possible to be ashamed of being an American, and that our fears of world conflict and nuclear holocaust are not focused on Moscow or Peking, but on Washington, D.C.

"We ask you to remove the shame and enable this country to return to the much more compelling, honorable struggle of defeating poverty, disease, ignorance, and fear within our own boundaries, and anywhere else these forces prevail.

"Very sincerely yours,

"LARRY FANTL,
"SUSAN FANTL."

ALAMEDA, CALIF., May 6, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: This senseless war in Viet Nam is the most terrible thing that has ever happened to our country. It is none of our business what the countries of Asia do.

The power to send troops to foreign lands and to get us into war, should be taken away from the President and restored to Congress, where our Constitution placed it.

The people of Viet Nam have their own ideas of how to live and cannot understand anything different. Of course they all want the money we so lavishly pour in.

I am seventy years old and am more worried about the fate of our country than ever before.

I thank you for trying to get us out of this mess. I am a native of Oregon and am proud to think that the representative of that state is making such a good fight.

All of the hand-outs the President can make does not compensate for the loss of our wonderful young men. They are like sheep led to be slaughtered.

Sincerely,

LILLEAN H. HENDERSON.

MANHASSET, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,
May 25, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are so grateful for your courageous leadership in opposing U.S. official policy in Vietnam.

Thank you.

FRANCINE BARKAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., May 25, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to express my support of the position you have taken concerning United States foreign policy, especially in Vietnam. Your courageous determination in speaking out against whatever you believe to be wrong will, I hope, continue. Thank you for putting your country's future ahead of your own political future.

And thank you, thank you for your recent observation that were John F. Kennedy our president today, he most probably would not have us in this unholy mess! I became annoyed when editorialists claim that there is no difference between the Johnson and what would have been the Kennedy policy. In fact, I see grounds for the impeachment of President Johnson for his total disregard of the constitution concerning declaration of war. Also, his claim that we are preserving freedom for the people of Asia (by burning and bombing them and their villages and supporting a military dictator whose hero is Hitler) sickens me.

Again, I urge you to continue your opposition to our presence in Vietnam.

Very truly yours,

JOAN LEIBY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I endorse your stand on our position in the Vietnam war and think it is wonderful that the United States Senate has such an able spokesman for liberalism.

The American people welcome the debate and investigation of the awesome issues of this terrible dilemma.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE SCHADEL.

BAYSIDE, N.Y., May 20, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to thank you for everything you have done and said about Vietnam. We are very lucky to have had the opportunity of hearing your views presented at the Senate Foreign Relations hearings on television.

11528

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 2, 1966

We are not organization people, we never marched, nor sat in; or were we ever strongly committed to any cause. This letter is the beginning of our commitment. We thank you for your leadership and inspiration.

As much as you need us, Senator, we need you more. Our strength and our hope lies in you.

Sincerely yours,
GLORIA & PAUL LITTMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I respectfully commend you on your firm stand against our involvement in Vietnam and express my complete agreement with your views.

Yours sincerely,

DOROTHY BLASS.

MESQUITE, TEX., May 11, 1966.

Senator W. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please let me once again assure you of my support in your fight against our involvement in Viet Nam. Please continue to do all you can to inform the country about this senseless and dangerous war. I keep hoping that finally good sense and not ill inspired emotions will prevail and result in our disengagement.

Very truly yours,

H. H. BEHNER.

ALBANY, N.Y., May 23, 1966.

DEAR SIR: Such strength of mind and character is an inspiration to all of us.

God bless you.

A TEENAGER.

HOUSTON, TEX., May 25, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I heard you on Tel. & I think we need a few more talkers like you that will speak out against this terrible slaughter of our men in Viet Nam. Surely with all the brains & educated people there should be better means of ending a war, that seems to be dragging us in further.

Please write me & tell me what we women can do in our small way.

I know you are a Democrat but I'm hoping a Republican will be our next Pres. for the main reason, that all the wars, I can remember of have been under Democratic Pres.

I'm just now hearing reports on radio telling what effect the war is having on this country & that war with China is unavoidable. That makes us shudder.

Why can't you be instrumental in doing something about this useless killing. I'd say pull out & settle with talks, negotiations, policing or anything. I think if we stop the aggression they will stop.

Go to them & make some sacrificing before our country goes bankrupt. We have too many irons in the fire.

Mrs. HENRY KREBS.

BERKELEY, CALIF., May 25, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to inform you of my complete support of your opposition to the President's Vietnam policy. I beg you to continue it, and prevent the disastrous consequences which the President has chosen to weigh his country.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. MANDEL.

LITTLETON, COLO., May 26, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am in complete agreement with your views on the war in Viet Nam. I am thankful that there are still men, like you, around who can view situa-

tions of this nature, realistically, placing the security of our own nation in first place.

I find, however, that my own objections are a little bit different than yours. So I am sending you this letter that I am also sending to the Denver Post, in the hopes that you may find in it a germ of an idea that can be used to defend your position.

These are not only my views, but represent the views of my 23 year old son, and his friends, who have fought in that war in Viet Nam. They know what those people are like, from their own experiences with them. They believe the cause to be hopeless and feel deeply discouraged with our commitment to defend all of Asia. From their point of view, this could involve the rest of their lives and the lives of their children, as well—if Americans could last that long.

I wish, with all of my heart, that you, or someone like you, could be our president.

Thank you.

Mrs. BERNICE R. HOWE.

"LITTLETON, COLO., May 26, 1966.

"Aren't we kidding ourselves about the war in Viet Nam?

"While President Johnson states and restates with monotonous regularity that we must stop the Communists in Viet Nam to prevent them from taking over all of Asia, Raul Castro, Cuban Armed Forces Minister, determines to redouble Cuban's aid to Communist revolutions in the belief that these revolutions are the Achilles heel of the United States. (Rocky Mountain News article, page 3, May 24, 1966)

"Mr. Johnson seems to be under the impression that when and if the Communists realize that they cannot take over South Viet Nam by force, they will somehow or other be intimidated or discouraged from further aggression in other countries. I wonder why it has not occurred to Mr. Johnson that we have already forced the Communists to realize that they could not win in Korea, Berlin, and . . . we did show them that they could not bring those missiles into Cuba. They were not intimidated by these experiences with our determination, yet, Mr. Johnson asks us to forget the past and believe that this time it is going to be different. This time the Communists are going to learn their lesson, once and for all.

"But, if we stop to view this situation from Maj. Castro's point of view, it does seem that it might be much more profitable for the Communist world powers to involve the Americans in a series of small wars rather than risk their own manpower, their own economic resources, and especially their own reputations in one Big War.

"If this were their intention, they could instigate little wars in all of these 39 other countries that we are now obligated to defend. If they could keep a war going in each of these countries for as short a time as three years per country, they could keep us pretty busy for the next 117 years. While we were expending our strengths in these wars, the Communists would have more than sufficient time to develop their home projects, especially their space projects, and we could wake up one morning to discover that we were being controlled by a 'Man in the Moon' and that man would not be an American.

"It seems to me that we must stop, somewhere along the line, take a clear, hard, cold look at our 'enemy' and wonder if we are not playing this game just exactly the way he wants it played.

"It seems to me, that we must stop, somewhere along the line, and evaluate this situation from different points of view, considering other methods of dealing with this problem or we could wake up one morning and discover ourselves to be so weakened from a long series of little wars that the Communists have won by default.

"I, personally, do not believe that the Communists plan to stop when the war in Viet Nam is over, I personally, do not believe that the Communists care whether or not they win or lose the war. I believe that their purpose was served when the first American dollar was spent and the first American boy died over there.

"Even as we sit here wondering about it all, I suspect that the Communists are already planning their next adventure. Where will it be? They have a pretty wide choice. We may have Thailand and Malaysia well protected, but that leaves India, Egypt, Israel, Cuba, South America.

"Let's face the hard, cold, revolting facts. If we are going to commit our military and our economy to every Communist-instigated revolution that comes along, the Communists are going to have us dancing. Just like the old-time Western bully could keep the town drunk dancing by shooting bullets around his feet, the Communists could keep us dancing by instigating revolutions.

"And, just as that town drunk would be considered a fool if he felt victorious for having avoided all of the bullets, I think we are kidding ourselves if we believe, for one moment, that a victory in Viet Nam is a real victory over Communism.

"BERNICE R. HOWE."

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, May 25, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for speaking out so strongly on our policy in Vietnam during the hearings that were televised two weeks ago. Please continue to pressure for a change in our policy. I find more and more people who think that it is imperative that we stop this military action.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH STERNBERG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

We love you.

Keep working for peace in Vietnam.

THE MARROWS.

MT. VERNON, N.Y.

SOUTH BEND, IND., May 24, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a long-time conservative Republican I feel compelled to write to voice my support for your stand on Vietnam. We have put ourselves in the position of saving these people from themselves even if it means killing them all off to do so.

The entire Vietnam situation has been a series of errors in judgment (misjudgment is human) but instead of rectifying these errors the administration has bulled its way along trying to cover them up by applying more force. Unfortunately this force means heavy loss of life on all sides. Like it or not we are the hand that is manipulating the military puppet ruling Vietnam.

Keep up the fight.

Very truly yours,

DON J. BARTH.

THE REYNOLDSBURG METHODIST CHURCH,
Reynoldsburg, Ohio, May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for the section of a recent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discussing our involvement in Vietnam.

Many of us agree with you wholeheartedly and want to encourage you as you become the conscience of the nation in regard to our involvement in Southeast Asia. We greatly admire your courage in taking this very unpopular stand and want you to know that

June 2, 1966

many of us share with you the deep concern about our commitments there and the treatment of the Vietnamese people. Keep up the good work and let me assure you of the gratitude of the many persons who share your concerns.

Sincerely,

CHARLES D. KIRSCH.

MAY 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to let you know of my gratitude to you for your courageous labors in trying to bring sanity to our country's headlong drive in a war of hate and terror.

I also wish to tell you that all of my family, all of my friends and acquaintances have been against this war from the first—(Where does this "consensus" come from? It can only be from those people who do not read except superficially, and from the hate-mongers and reactionaries.)

In deepest gratitude,

IRENE DONNELLY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

BRYAN, TEX., May 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my deep appreciation and gratefulness to you for the stands you have been and are taking before our present Administration regarding their foreign policy programs—namely Viet Nam. Because of this you have taken criticism but, nevertheless, have been constant and untiring in your effort—the sign of a great man.

It is my hope that our president will soon take more advice from people such as yourself than he seems to be taking at this particular time.

May God bless you and work with you in your efforts to bring peace to this troubled world.

Respectfully yours,

MARY E. PARRETT.

MAY 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: When you feel like running for the Presidency—count on my vote. I refer to your Viet Nam position.

I am recommending it to the President and my other elected representatives. Thank you for a kind of patriotism that appeals to the national and honest mind.

J. A. CREEDON.

HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF.

MONTGOMERYVILLE, PA., May 24, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I'm writing you this letter in regards to my views on the Viet Nam War.

To me this is one of the worst wars ever fought between mankind. I've watched you and listened to you and Senator DIRKSEN and FULBRIGHT as you plead and present your views on this horrible war to stop it. And you are being greatly admired for your actions you have taken especially when you questioned the Defense Secretary, MacNamara, in those hearings in the Senate, and we didn't get it from the press, your views. It came live by television. And that we dare to believe.

I'm sending you a clipping from our daily newspaper, and I also listened to him on television and watched him, U Thant, as he spoke from Atlantic City.

Senator MORSE, I have three sons (all the children we have). The oldest was drafted and he served a portion of his two years in Germany. Just as he got home the other

son left for the service (drafted) and he was sent to Korea during the conflict there. The youngest son was drafted after he was married a year. He has been in the service six months. He is home on furlough from Camp Gordon, Georgia. When his leave has ended, he is being sent to Viet Nam. I have had an exceptionally hard life as a mother. My husband is not well. He works at a light job, all he can stand. And sometimes hardly able to go to work. I wrote President Johnson just explaining to him that I've been through so much and since we did share our (2) sons in foreign duty just asking him if the third son could not be stationed in the States to complete his duty to his country. He is commander-in-chief of the Army. He could have said Yes, and had him stationed here. I had a letter from Julian Wilson saying he was asked to answer it for President Johnson. And the letter contained conditions that could not be met as I will not go out to exaggerate the conditions and that was "only the presence of the son would eliminate the problems with which I'm faced. And that would just be telling a falsehood. And I would not go out to embarrass my son to fill out papers to that effect. I have had many problems which works a hardship on me. But this is the worst problem I've had to try to get through with. Senator MORSE, mothers' hearts are aching and bleeding all over the world tonight because of this war in Viet Nam. When I sat before my television, and watched a film of the bloody riot in Da Nang tonight reported by Ron Nessim, our reporter there, and saw and heard mothers screaming and crying over their little children who had been shot to death, plus many more heartbreaking scenes. God help us and help us quickly to get out of Viet Nam. You would be surprised to hear that in such a small community where I live, people are talking of demonstrations in Washington. I would never think of coming to Washington as a demonstrator. But I'm appealing to you, if you have any influence in the White House, to ask President Johnson not to send my son to Viet Nam. And to bring those boys who are already there home. God has been so good to us as a nation, but so help me, if we go over there to kill and plunder like is going on over there, destroying life, and their homes, some day we will suffer because God promised it. And it will come to our homeland. Just what is happening over there. Let us stop it before it is too late. I would be glad for an answer.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HAROLD BIGGER.

P.S.—We shall pray daily for your guidance as a Senator who means so much to our country, and we shall be influenced as we go to the polls by those who let the American people know what's going on and will plead for the wrong things to be made right.

God bless you and direct you in all you do.

Julian Wilson is Personnel in the Dept. of the Army in which I think you surely would know. He is not to be blamed for the answer to my request. He has his duty to perform and he did the best he could.

FEDERATION OF SLOVENIAN PENSIONERS OF METROPOLITAN CLEVELAND,

Cleveland, Ohio, May 25, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: This Petition is just to let you know that 1200 members of the Federation of Slovenian Pensioners of Cleveland, Ohio, fully agree with your peace policy to stop the war in South Viet Nam, and we appreciate your efforts and courage to bring this brutal war to an end.

We further wish you all the success in your work for this human cause.

We remain sincerely yours,

KURT STOKEL,

President.

JOHN TAVIAR,

Secretary.

ANDREW BOZIEH,

Treasurer.

UNITED STATES CONSTRUCTION CORP.,
Sarasota, Fla., May 25, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: If the great Americans of yesteryear could come back, they would recognize, as I do, your constant and dedicated contribution to keep these wonderful United States free and strong.

Sincerely yours,

SANDE ROCKE.

PALM DESERT, CALIF.

May 26, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Inclosed is a copy of some of the paragraphs from the letters I received from a friend who was drafted and fighting in Vietnam. We correspond regularly and I received a letter from him twice a week. Now I have had no letter for over a month. I trust and pray he is not another casualty in Vietnam's stupid religious war. Outside of protecting our oil interests, what reason have we for mixing in this civil strife? If you know of any other reason I would like to know.

You deserve great credit for your tireless work in the televised Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. Please carry on for a helpless American public.

You have my humble thanks and good wishes,

BARBARA KNAPP.

"I'll really be crazy when I get back to the States. I don't think I'll be able to live with myself."

"When I die I'll go to heaven because I've spent my time in hell (Vietnam)."

"One reason we haven't won this conflict yet is because you can't see the V.C. It's like fighting a ghost. Nearly all the tunnels they have are eight stories deep."

"We only lost one man on this last operation—but that was one too many."

"We find villagers and figure they aren't V.C. and let them go, but if it were up to me, I would kill them all (women, children and old men). They're all helping the V.C. one way or another. Every village we go into there are women, children and old men, but no young men from the ages of 17 to 45 and they're out fighting us. That's why I would kill them all. You would understand if you were over here in my place—most everybody would, but they aren't over here. Really, I can't put it in writing how I feel, all I can say is that it's a silly and stupid damn war. The V.C. don't even know what they're fighting for."

"This next operation we go on I'm going to kill anything I see, women or children. You probably think I'm nuts, but if you've ever been next to one of your best buddies and he gets shot through the stomach and you see his guts hanging out and he dies right beside you, would have the same feeling I do about any V.C."

"They only have two seasons over here—hot and dry and hot and wet. It has been kind of hot the last week—around 120°."

"It's Hell over here, Pure Hell, no one knows how it is over here unless they've been here."

11530

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 2, 1966

FULTON, Mo., May 25, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks very much for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD "Legal Issues Of U.S. Position In Vietnam". I shall study it diligently. There is a bountiful flow of propaganda through this section of the country, and I am certainly grateful for something that can be depended upon to be the truth. I appreciate Your effort to get the truth to the people of America.

Senator Morse words would fail me to express my appreciation of You in your struggle for the Nation's welfare. I wish I could be of more help, at least be able to send more encouragement Your way. Many of us do look to You to bring out the truth. We have great admiration for You, and esteem You very highly as one of America's great statesmen. And I might add a great force in our hope for our nation.

Our prayers will be directed your way, and we do pray that God will continue to bless you with health and wisdom to carry on the good work, as you have in the past.

Cordially,

E. J. MILLER.

PAWTUCKET, R.I.,
May 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to let you know that I approve of your efforts and position on the Viet Nam Issue.

I hope you will continue your efforts and wish you every success.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS DAGATA.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
May 24, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed copy of a letter I have just sent President Johnson regarding the Draft and Viet Nam. When I lived in Beaverton, Oregon I supported you, not because I completely agreed with you but because I felt you did have the courage of your convictions and were and are by modern standards a Most Honest Man—I still feel the same.

I'm a salesman, contacting and conversing with people at many levels and degrees of thinking and intelligence, you could say the mass or group who are the heart of our country. You are right this great mass are rapidly changing their attitude on Viet Nam, the Draft, Poverty Program, Great Society, etc. and if national elections could be held right now the Administration would be in for a shock. Unless it's done by a Master, people will only be sheep for so long and I think that's happening now, the sheep are returning to people, glib words won't do. Last Week, House Furnishing Daily, a Fairchild's Publication published a story on A.I.D. to Viet Nam. The reporter really laid it out and we are apparently grossly undermanned and mismanaged and supporting the Viet Cong along with everyone else in food, drugs, and clothing.

I listened and read President Johnson, Mr. Rusk, Mr. McNamara and quite a few more but they're not reaching me with the old platitudes and worn out phrases. I'm not against military service, strong defense or help for anyone who needs it but watching the newscasts from Viet Nam and the action of the various factions I'd like someone in Government to explain in language we could understand, why we're over there and why we're staying over there—I don't think those people would know or care in the majority if they were Communist or a Democracy. Is it possible we are getting so

many highly educated men in government they're developing fat between their ears. Certainly hope Senator Morse you keep at it.

Sincerely,

HAROLD H. LEVORA.

"The President of the United States

"L. B. Johnson

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Sunday nite May 15 I watched my only son Jim and 120 others in his Co. come thru San Francisco Airport in full combat equipment headed for Da Nang. I witnessed their debarkation from the plane with mixed emotions and as Jim and his group approached the ramp I turned and looked down to see an 18 or 19 year old Sailor coming up the ramp on crutches—one leg gone below the knee. Not even thinking of past casualties—or future—I wondered if this whole Viet affair was worth that boy's leg.

"Jim like many others has been in an out of college and while in an interim period between work and college he was drafted May 9, 1965. At the time he was under the care of our family physician as result of an accident that closed one side of his nose. Our Dr. referred him to a Specialist and the Draft Board postponed induction to allow an operation. Three weeks after the surgery when he wasn't even permitted to blow his nose to avoid puncturing the membrane and with an allergy to dust, he was inducted into the Armed Services. At Ft. Leonard Wood, where he took basic, the Medics discovered he was also allergic to grass but he made it thru with his unit because of personal pride and self determination. His induction under these circumstances was hard to understand altho we had at that time considerable adverse publicity from groups at Cal. and San Jose State on how to avoid the draft.

"After basic he was to go to Ft. Knox but was held and then assigned to Ft. Gordon, attached to HQ Co. and while there he volunteered for overseas duty with 29th Civil Affairs Co. where, as PFC Jim J. Levora, U.S. 66401293 he is one of few Draftees in this Regular Army unit. Sunday Jim told me if he had had any idea the Viet Nam civil situation would be as it is he'd not have volunteered. Looking at all the officers and men in the group I didn't see many smiles.

"I'm proud of Jim—all the way—for his conduct thru this entire course of events but personally unhappy under the circumstances and present conditions. There are so many inequities in our Draft System of which you are aware—deferments of many kinds—CLASS deferments—to dumb—to smart—to rich—to poor and there's the pro athlete. Pro football players can get hit by plenty of muscle—August thru January but are unfit for military service—this is hogwash.

"I figure I'm Mr. Joe Average American and as such am entitled to be heard, even tho this never reaches you. I'm not a well educated man and can't bandy the words around like you Mr. President or Mr. Rusk, but I am a registered Democrat of 34 years and articulate enough to have actively helped the Party until recent years when I have leaned more to the independent. I'm in contact with people every day—I should say PEOPLE—and even the hard core pro Viet Nam are turning, saying they're sick of this whole stinking mess. I intend to write everyone I've supported or support to let them know my views.

"In your position I can appreciate it's hell if you do and hell if you don't but with the deterioration of an already bad situation, it might be better to do what someone said—fight and run away to live to fight another day.

"Sincerely,

"HAROLD R. LEVORA."

ALTOONA, ALA.,
May 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Senator MORSE: I appreciate your stand on Vietnam during the recent debate. I wish Alabama's senators had stood with you. I feel you spoke for me and the majority, if not all, of this state's citizens. We can still hope "Even in the midst of the Great Society" as long as we have men of your caliber in Washington.

I am a widow of a WWI veteran, a mother and grandmother and I care about this nation's tomorrows. I feel Oregon is proud of you. I am,

Gratefully,

Mrs. L. P. WILLINGHAM.

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
Sodus, N.Y., May 31, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have recently received your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statement outlining your views on our involvement in Viet Nam, and I have followed yours and others' statements on T.V. upholding the same views.

May I express my heartiest agreement with this position. Keep up the good work, and it is a good work. Before it is too late let us hope that wisdom will prevail over hysteria and expediency.

Most sincerely,

J. RUSSELL DUNLAP.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
Little Neck, N.Y., May 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The American people and the world have come to expect your continued courageous voice in opposition to the outrageous war we are waging in Vietnam.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL TOBIN.

DEAR SENATOR: Today I heard the latest casualty list of this undeclared war. 146 dead and 820 wounded.

When I read or hear something on the radio or TV on what your views are on this undeclared war I am in agreement with you.

I do, to not believe our government has any right supporting a military regime, which is not an elected government of the people. Backing Ky as we are, is the same as asking ourselves in.

I believe there would be more opposition to this undeclared war but for one reason:

The average person does not read the newspapers (as he should) or listen to news broadcasts or read extensively. Some way must be found to reach this type of person. They do not really care about this undeclared war as long as it does not include or affect them.

What would happen if the hearings were re-opened and the people were to hear witnesses on the following:

1. What is the estimated cost to our government that will have to be paid out to South Viet Nam in reparations? (Reparations will have to be explained.) What will this cost be to the individual taxpayer?

2. What would the public reaction be if someone from the HEW department told the public about the malaria and other diseases the American soldiers are contracting in South Viet Nam? What possibility is there of them bringing these foreign diseases back home with them? Will our doctors be able to recognize them and treat them if they are contagious and spread to our civilian population?

June 2, 1966

This is something I have always wondered and I think the rest of the public should know this too. If you took the total population of South Viet Nam and divided it into the total cost of all the money our government has spent in that country so far, how much would this be per person?

How much is one billion dollars?

1. How many \$3,000 cars would it buy?
2. How many \$15,000 homes?
3. How many four year college educations at \$3,000 a year?

4. If you had carpeting at ten dollars a square yard how many miles of carpet could you buy for one billion dollars?

5. How many men would it take, earning 10,000 a year to earn a billion dollars in 20 years?

One billion dollars is just a word or a name. Break this myth word down so that the public knows what one billion dollars can do.

These are things I have wondered about.

1. What happens to the weapons of the deserting South Viet Nam soldier? I heard on the radio today they are deserting at the rate of 6000 a month. Where do they go? What do they do? Is there any punishment for this? Could they reenlist again and do the same thing over again?

2. What kind of people live in South Viet Nam?

3. What is a Buddhist monk?

Many times what you say is taken out of context and your meaning is lost and distorted. I wish you could go on national television and let the people know your views in their entirety. I would feel privileged to contribute to such a cause.

Sincerely,

A NERVOUS NELLIE WHO IS GETTING MORE NERVOUS.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,

May 30, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Please accept my thanks for being a man with the courage to stand up for his beliefs.

I agree with you—this is a war we should not be fighting.

Let's not save face. Let's save lives. God bless you.

Sincerely,

RUTH ASHWORTH.

CHICAGO, ILL.

May 28, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have never before written to a Senator from a state other than my own. But I felt it necessary to write you and express my gratitude for your courageous stand on the VIET NAM war issue. One often reads of a Senator's mail running in a certain ratio on an issue. So I felt I should add this letter to those approving your stand.

The Viet Name war is indeed a tragedy, not only because it involves great suffering for the Viet Name people, but because the United States is disgracing its proud tradition of the defender of freedom around the world. What freedom are we defending in Viet Nam? The National Liberation Front does not represent freedom, but neither does the cruel Ky dictatorship that our dollars and men are defending. It comes down to a question of a right wing or a left wing dictatorship, and I don't think any kind of dictatorship is worth one American life. The question of aggression is also absurd. North and South Viet Nam have almost equal populations, so if South Viet Nam had her people behind her, she could easily defend against aggression. The truth is we have become involved in a three sided civil war. The Buddhists who are truly the freedom fighters are opposed by the Saigon dictatorship. The NLF who helped rid the country of the French is also opposed by the Saigon government and the U.S. The ones who back the Saigon government are the rich land

owners who have made the poverty of the country and thus the NLF, and the U.S. This is the shame of America in Viet Nam.

Please keep up your criticism of our policy. You will have those who really love their country behind you. But when someone quotes the famous saying "my country, may she always be right, but my country, right or wrong," remember that this is probably what some Nazi said when he shoved a Jew in a gas chamber. Keep this in mind instead, "my country, may she always be right, but when she's wrong, may God give me the strength to help make her right."

Sincerely,

LOUIS KOVACH.

OSWEGO UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

Oswego, Ill., May 31, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for sending me the copy from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of your speech in the Senate last February 25, inserting in the RECORD the report of the Lawyers Committee On American Policy Toward Viet Nam.

I have read this with great interest.

I want you to know that I support the stand which you are taking on Viet Nam. I preached on this subject along with a large number of the ministers in this area last Sunday and I found your speech very helpful. I will be glad to receive copies of further speeches which you may make on this question. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

WOODROW WOOLEY.

PEORIA, ILL.,

May 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: I believe that after hearing some of Sec. U Thant's recent speech it might be a good time to press for some sort of peace talks through the UN. I think that world opinion must be very strong against as at this time. Given the Buddhist civil war and their clear call to all the world to get the U.S. off their backs the time is ripe to make a real effort in the UN to stop this war. I think that U Thant was clearly asking the American people to take a stand and demand that this war be stopped.

Senator Morse, what this country is doing in Viet Nam is a disgrace. I am so ashamed of my country it just sickens me.

Is there no way to stop this administration?

It's clear to most anyone that this country is looking for a pretext to start a war with China. Then this country will have had it.

Signed

VERY WORRIED CITIZEN WHO DOESN'T
KNOW WHERE TO TURN.

ST. ALBAN'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

Jacksonville, Fla., May 30, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have always supported the President and for a long time I thought that you were dead wrong. I now find that I cannot allow the proposed (Post election???) build up and escalation of the Viet Nam war to go without registering protest.

Keep up the good fight. God bless you.

Respectfully,

ROBERT C. JOHNSON, Jr.,

Vicar.

MAY 31, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have written to you before in behalf of the mothers of Portland and this time I have read an article that I think is excellent and shows exactly how

most of the people feel whether their sons are over in Viet Nam or not. "I object vigorously to the sacrifice of these young men in support of a policy that cannot win."

Why should we police the world? The function of the military is to defend our shores and why should we try to fight for some insane war which is just what the Viet Nam war is and particularly when these people don't want us there but want a chance to work out "their way of life" for themselves. Right now we have the Russians fishing on the west coast, the Cubans stirring up trouble again and the Viet Nam war also the Santo Domingo crisis.

I can't see where my son who has been gone two weeks now and we haven't heard a word and all the other boys who left when he did besides the thousands of others who are over there and have been for sometime do any good when they are told "to go home." Why should these Vietnamese make "torches" of themselves and blame us—we were trying to help but they don't want us.

Sincerely,

A MOM.

IDEALISTIC AND PRACTICAL

BEAVERTON, OREG.

To the EDITOR:

I am a conscientious objector, age 53. I object to the present foreign policy of my country and to the war we are waging in Viet Nam.

I am the father of two girls and four boys and anticipate my first son-in-law within six weeks. I believe in and enjoy the teenagers and young people of our community, state, and country. I object vigorously to the sacrifice of these young men in support of a policy that cannot win.

My objections are based on principles that are both idealistic and practical in philosophy.

In my opinion we are faced with three alternatives in Viet Nam. All discussion and all policy must relate to three choices. Unfortunately we are letting our governmental officials avoid facing up to these alternatives which are as follows:

(1) Smash all those who would resist us in Viet Nam. Bomb them, kill them, destroy them until they yield to our command, our will, our purpose, and our plans for them. Ultimately in pursuit of this alternative we may have to cross the border into China to impose our will on the Chinese. Smash them. Our will must prevail. Our flag over all is the ultimate in this direction. I believe that it is agreed that we cannot accomplish these goals.

(2) Fight until we can negotiate a treaty and draw a line which we can defend from now until doomsday. We are defending a line in Germany, in Korea, and a perimeter in the Caribbean. We have taken upon ourselves the function of policing the world and responding in force to every conflagration in the world. We can't win this way either. There is no end to this way.

(3) The third alternative to which a growing number of people are subscribing is to get out of Viet Nam. We recognize a host of objections and difficulties but we are sure that we must accomplish a complete and strategic retreat.

The violent screams of shock of those who want to fight communism rend the air at this alternative. Our question to them is, why, when there is apparently as much communism in Cuba and South America as in Viet Nam, do we fight a war 10,000 miles away? Why did we not fight in Cuba?

We are not going to win even though we bomb and bomb and finally smash and wreck this little country of Viet Nam.

It is not our purpose as a country to rule the world. If we are enlightened as some of our politicians claim, it is not practical or idealistic to share our enlightenment via the

11532

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 2, 1966

military who threaten devastation with every penetration.

The function of our military is to defend our shores. We are wasting our purpose, our goals, and our power in this insane war some 10,000 miles from our shores.

(We must continue to believe in freedom, in enlightenment, in peaceful methods and we must then allow other peoples of this world to proceed with their own freedom and beliefs.)

There are many methods by which we can share our beliefs, our hopes, and our help extended to the people of the earth without imposing our force and arrogance. Our military power and strength must be conserved and used wisely whenever anyone threatens us at our shores or in the air above.

The world is not ours to rule, it is ours to live in with others.

Our present course will continue towards a complete dissipation of military strength and spiritual and moral power.

It's time to turn away. It's time to back out. It's no time to force ourselves blindly forward in order to save face. The price is too great. (My children and my neighbor's children are very special to me. Bring them home.) Shorten our lines of communication and turn the other cheek.

Our final choice is to choose between conquering the world or living in it freely and letting others live as they would choose to live. We can never live freely as conquerors. It's never been done. It's never to be done.

Only the third alternative will lead us to peace. Let us rapidly de-escalate our war effort, negotiate at every opportunity, and pursue every avenue of peace even at the expense of our world image, at the expense of our world status and with a willingness to lose face, all the time remaining strong and ready to defend our own shores.

VERNON D. HANSEN, M.D.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,

May 27, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last night (May 26, 1966) on a Miami Radio Station WINZ on an Open Phone discussion program conducted by Alan Courtney, I was so mad when he called both you and Sen. FULBRIGHT "Communists"—"termites" in your outspoken criticism of the war in Vietnam. Usually a smart conductor of these programs refrains from comment and lets the public phone in their views (unless they become too obnoxious). Dissent is the right of a true Democracy unless one advocates the overthrow of our government; but not false vilification.

Our government has constantly called So. Vietnam a Republic—when in truth it has been ruled by coup after coup. We now have there a civil war—Catholics against Buddhists that puts the burden on U.S.A.

In the last Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Vietnam on T.V. it seemed to me most members were doubtful of our wisdom in being in this insignificant little Asian Country.

In the mean time our fine young men are dead or wounded; our big planes and military equipment are lost, by a so-called commitment in which we seem to be the heaviest participator.

Hope the Fall elections will more clearly show the will of the taxpayers.

Sincerely,

HELEN E. BRICE.

TAYLOR, TEX.,
June 1, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I have followed with great interest your position on various legislative and governmental affairs and want

to congratulate you on your independence of thought and action, knowing that it would be much easier for you to conform to the thinking of the majority.

I would like to add that I often disagree with your viewpoint but feel convinced that honest and constructive opposition and expression of one's thoughts are the true mark of a statesman.

Feeling that you may be getting letters of the "other kind", I simply want to give you a bit of encouragement in this letter.

Yours very truly,

L. D. HAMMACK.

SEVASTOPOL, CALIF.,
May 25, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hope you don't feel too discouraged over Mr. Morgan's defeat in Oregon. I think you are doing a wonderful job of opposing a monstrous evil and I know millions of people are thankful for your continuous efforts to bring some sanity into our insane foreign policy.

Sincerely,

LLOYD M. ALLEN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
May 26, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am thankful there are more and more voices of sanity speaking out against this useless, wicked, costly war in Vietnam. Your leadership toward ending the war and working to rebuild normal relations with Communist China is heartening.

Sincerely,

JOSEPHINE M. BENTON.

BETHLEHEM LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Brodhead, Wis., May 26, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for sending me recently the speech you gave in the Senate of the United States, on Friday, February 26th of this year regarding the legal issues of this country's position in Viet Nam.

I am impressed with your excellent analysis of this situation and I find myself compelled in most every angle to agree with you. I have followed your reasoning and admire your courage.

Recently Congressman KASTENMEIER wrote me regarding the position of Senator FULBRIGHT and I am pleased that the concern of this country is being guided by men of wisdom such as yours.

Sincerely,

Rev. LOWELL H. MAYS, Pastor

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post,
May 18, 1966]

A GI WIDOW'S QUESTION: WHY VIET NAM?
(By Barry Cunningham)

The young widow's eyes were reddened from anger as well as tears. Under her glasses, the skin puffed out in raw circles. Her eyelids were damp and sore.

"I've been crying since last Saturday," she said, stamping out a cigaret, "What good does it do?"

She buried the butt in a paper napkin. And rolled the napkin into a tight wad to dry her eyes.

"This war is useless," she snapped. "My husband said so in his letters before he died. He hated the whole slimy war."

Juanita Butcher's marriage to a Viet Nam combat hero ended in tragedy last weekend when Sgt. Reubin Butcher, of 148-12 115th Ave., Jamaica, Queens, strayed into a barrage of his own unit's artillery fire.

BODY COMING HOME

Sometime today, the 23-year-old 1st Cavalry Division soldier's body will be flown to New York in a metal casket.

Meanwhile, his 22-year-old widow struggles within herself to find some word that will help to explain the bewilderment and anguish.

Her father, Robert L. James, a Transit Authority employe, criss-crossed the living room of the family home yesterday, banging his fists against the walls.

"Gangsters," he growled, jabbing his finger at the Defense Department telegram. The words, "died of wounds from friendly artillery fire" were underlined in pencil.

"To me, that sounds like a bunch of gangsters shooting at one another in the same room," he said. "We don't know who we're fighting over there, do we? We're just shooting and killing every which way."

The husky subway worker said his son-in-law was first wounded during a Viet Cong sneak attack last February.

Grenade shrapnel ripped into the soldier's right arm and leg, taking him out of combat, the father-in-law said, making his death on Saturday even more bewildering.

James said Sgt. Butcher "worried about not being able to write to Juanita" because of his wounds.

Three unopened letters postmarked "Viet Nam" were spread out on the dining room table as James spoke. All were addressed to Juanita from her husband. James said he wouldn't show them to his daughter until sedatives given by their family doctor had worn off.

SHE'S UNABLE TO EAT

He went back to the living room. "You ought to eat something," he urged Juanita, who had refused food since Saturday.

She had heard him mention the letters. Instantly, she went into hysterics. The sedatives started to take effect and a few moments later she quieted. She fidgeted with the straps on a pair of white fur slippers and talked of her job as a Wall Street secretary.

Then her eyes shifted to the mantel. She gazed at a glossy photograph of her husband in uniform, remembering how he had written "everything is so desolate in Korea" during his 13-month tour of duty there in 1963.

EVEN WORSE IN VIETNAM

"It's twice as bad in Vietnam," he wrote to her last December. A graduate of Eli Whitney HS in Queens, Sgt. Butcher married Juanita—his high school sweetheart—while on leave in the winter of 1963.

"He had big plans to come home and start raising a family," his widow recalled in a halting voice choked with grief. "We had only nine more weeks to wait for each other."

Then the expression on her face went dead. "He wrote to me that he had killed a man. He saw some of his friends killed. I couldn't take it any more."

"I told him to keep writing me, but please don't say anything about the blood."

As she spoke, her father continued to pace back and forth across the carpet.

OPPOSES THE WAR

"I've been listening to this man from Arkansas—Mr. [Sen.] FULBRIGHT," he said, "and [Sen.] MORSE, too."

"They say we're getting nowhere in Vietnam. I agree with them."

"These pickets and the boys who burn their draft cards aren't crazy."

He said his son-in-law had written home that "most of us don't know who we're fighting or why we're here."

James tugged at his moustache.

"You don't have freedom of speech when you're in uniform," he said. "You are afraid to say anything."

June 2, 1966

"I know. I'm a city worker. I'm afraid to say anything. In fact, maybe I shouldn't say this, but my son-in-law's death was a waste."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post,
May 21, 1966]

PACK IT IN
(By Pete Hamill)

The guy was wearing the green beret of the Special Forces, and he was standing in a bar on Tu Do St. in Saigon, drinking in a kind of desperate silence.

He would not talk, even to the slim young bar hostess opposite him, who was happily taking his money. After three whiskeys, he stood up, cursed Saigon, and lurched out the door. The girls all giggled.

I saw him again a few days later, being helped by an MP into a jeep. His face was mashed and bloody, and some of his teeth were gone. I guess he had been mugged. Three young Vietnamese in white shirts stood on the corner, laughing.

So when I think about Saigon now, or look at the photographs coming in on the photo printers, I always remember the way the girls laughed at that man, and the incredibly cruel faces of those boys, standing in safety, enjoying his torment. I am sure that when the moral giants of the United Buddhist Church call out the civilian troops, they are with them.

Those young men are free in Saigon, while the sons of Americans are being killed in the countryside. For the third time in recent weeks, more American soldiers were killed in that war than Vietnamese, which means that the Vietnamese have simply stopped fighting. They are more interested in killing each other in places like Da Nang or Hue than they are in fighting the Viet Cong, and that means we will do the fighting for them.

That means that all this year, the American dead will be piling up while the sweet propaganda comes smoothly out of Washington telling us that they will not be dying in vain. It says here that Washington is lying. Those men are now dying in vain.

There is a case to be made, I suppose, for fighting for the ideals which this country once represented, and at its best, still does. Anyone who has ever visited a Communist country knows that freedom is not a cheap word, even when it becomes debased. I need not apologize for saying that after seeing a lot of other countries, I love this more than all.

But it is becoming increasingly difficult to accept certain things. We civilians run this country; Lyndon Johnson, Dean Rusk and Robert McNamara work for us; we do not work for them. And in our name, they are saying that our children and our brothers must die because Satanism in the form of the Red Chinese and the Viet Cong has suddenly sprung up in a half-country in Southeast Asia. The representatives of Satanism are striking evil blows at a pure and shining legitimate government, and we, the American people, will risk even death to defend that government.

But that government has never governed anything. It does not govern in the countryside. It must kill its citizens in places like Da Nang and Hue to even come close to governing there. It governs Saigon the way a rather cynical madam handles a brothel. They will fight to the death to control Saigon, all right, because that is where the Americans sign the tabs.

But they will not be fighting much out in the countryside anymore. They don't have to do that. My kid brothers and your children will do that for them. They will not even defend themselves politically. They have Dean Rusk to do that for them.

They have the most powerful nation in the world to do everything for them now. We'll fight for them, apologize for them, feed

them, feed their bank accounts, populate their brothels, sleep with their women for them; if they ask, we shall certainly oblige.

Forget about Harlem. Forget about Bedford-Stuyvesant, and Hazard, Kentucky, and the backwoods of Alabama. The people who live there will fend for themselves. We have more important things to consider. We have to take care of My Tho and Da Nang and Qui Nhon and Cam Ne. It will only cost 18 billion dollars this year. Who cares if there are rats in the Red Hook schoolrooms? First things first. We have to keep those three kids on the Saigon street corner out of the insidious clutches of Ho Chi Minh.

I have two brothers in the Army now and my mother has three more waiting in the wings. The supply of kids like that is now deemed inexhaustible, so we can keep the war going for as long as we want.

Enough: I am no pacifist, but this war has lasted too long. Those men who are dying there tonight are dying like men, with courage and tenacity. But with Buddhists rioting in the streets, General Ky shooting down civilians, Henry Cabot Lodge nodding in approval, while we apologize again and add that more men are on the way, then someone had better think of something to tell their parents.

If one more dies under the present conditions, someone is guilty of a murderous sin. Now, finally, we should pack it in.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch,
May 27, 1966]

U THANT'S COUNSEL

Truth, as U Thant once observed, is one of the first victims of war. His words were confirmed once again this week as Secretary of State Rusk and Vice President HUMPHREY once again proclaimed the Administration's dedication to the search for peace in Viet Nam. Mr. Rusk repeated his offer to go to Geneva whenever anybody was there to negotiate with. Mr. HUMPHREY detailed anew the various peace offensive of the past and devoutly adopted U Thant's "prayer and wish" for peace as our own.

What is the simple truth? It is that the Administration spurned peace talk feelers repeatedly in 1964 and 1965. It is that U Thant's own efforts to arrange talks have been repeatedly and roughly rejected. It is that while publicly taking no sides in South Viet Nam's political turmoil the Administration has thrown every resource into the undercover support of a Saigon military junta whose first article of faith is an utter rejection of peace negotiations. It is that while paying lip-service to U Thant's "prayer and wish" the Administration obstinately refuses to heed U Thant's realistic counsel on the steps necessary to make peace.

The Secretary General of the UN renewed that counsel in his moving address to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers this week. Military methods, he said, will not restore peace; President Johnson once agreed with that. "This war must be stopped," said U Thant, "on the initiative of the participants, lest it get out of hand." And he repeated what he has often said, that the necessary conditions for peace include a return to the Geneva agreements, which were based on the principle of military neutralization of all Viet Nam; a prior scaling down of military operations (which would include an end to the bombing of North Viet Nam); and an agreement to negotiate with the actual combatants—in other words, the National Liberation Front as well as North Viet Nam.

These steps are reasonable if peace is genuinely the objective. So long as the United States rejects U Thant's counsel, which expresses the conscience of the world organization to which we so often pay verbal tribute, our verbal reiteration of peaceful intentions will fall on unbelieving ears throughout the world.

Some Americans, in bitter frustration, feel that the strands of history have become so hopelessly entangled that nothing can now be done to unravel an unwanted war. This seems plausible only in the context of the Administration's present policy, which is to back the Ky government's violent suppression of popular yearnings for peace and to continue escalation of the war.

If the basic decision were made to accept a negotiated settlement instead of chasing the illusion of military victory; if we supported the Viet Nameese forces that favor reconciliation, rather than an armed dictatorship which opposes it; if we adopted as our policy the establishment of a compromise, neutral government permitting our ultimate withdrawal, instead of trying to establish an anti-Communist government that could only exist under our permanent military protection—in this context, many doors to peace and mediation would open.

No vital national interest of ours keeps the doors closed. It is pride and arrogance and illusion—the illusion that we are engaged in a holy ideological war. U Thant is right in saying that the somber course of events has probably left to the Viet Nameese people no ideology at all except a passion for national identity or even survival. He is right in saying that no government or people is "likely to lose in stature or dignity or worldly advantage" from coming to terms with the world in which we actually live. He is right in calling upon those who have the power and the responsibility "to search objectively and without rancor for ways to end this historic tragedy."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
June 1, 1966]

U.N. HAS VITAL ROLE IN VIET NAM
(By David Lawrence)

The United States has only one way out of the Viet Nam dilemma—only one way that is honorable and consistent with the unselfish effort to save a small nation from the loss of its independence. That way is through the United Nations. The same principles which prompted the U.N. to send under its own auspices an allied army to repel aggression in Korea can be reaffirmed now.

What is blocking such a course? The answer is: A confident belief by the Communists—derived from reports of internal dissension in the United States—that if the war is prolonged this country will abjectly surrender. Secretary of State Dean Rusk in a speech last Saturday at Williamsburg, Va., deplored the misconceptions that are being spread abroad about American policy. He said:

"Professional diplomacy requires a certain amount of temporary secrecy: Secret information, secret discussions and negotiations. Public discussion of certain situations at certain times may be distorted by lack of knowledge of facts that are available to the President and secretary of state—yet which they cannot at the moment fully divulge.

"There must also be considered the practical fact that a show of division among our people can complicate the conduct of our foreign affairs. For example, there is the danger that a foreign government may miscalculate our intentions. There are strong reasons to believe that the militant Communists of Asia have been sustained by the conviction that world opinion or internal dissension within the United States will cause us to withdraw from South Viet Nam. That will not happen. But it is not easy to convince Hanoi and Peking."

As a matter of fact, just three days after the secretary's speech, a news dispatch from Hong Kong quoted the Red China News Agency as describing, in a 1,600-word article, a decline in the support of America's position in the Viet Nam war.

June 2, 1966

"The United States is being forsaken everywhere by its partners and followers," the Communist Chinese agency said. "A new and still greater anti-U.S. storm of revolutionary struggle is gathering."

The news agency quoted both Republicans and Democrats in the United States as saying American prestige in the world has fallen because of the Viet Nam war.

Rusk, further on in his speech, laid stress on the opportunity of the United Nations to maintain peace in the world. He said:

"The paramount issue of our time is whether or not the world is to be organized on the principles of freedom, peace and genuine co-existence sketched out in the preamble and Articles 1 and 2 of the United Nations charter. To that end, the American people have exerted large and unremitting efforts during the last 20 years."

Many people will wonder why the U.N. has not stepped in already to stop the war in Viet Nam. All sorts of excuses have been made by the secretary-general. There was no hesitation, however, by the U.N. in helping out in Africa a few years ago or in intervening recently in the Rhodesia controversy.

"Peace-keeping" has been heralded as one of the primary functions of the U.N. But today, while the principles are the same as they were when "peace-keeping" was carried on in the Congo, the situation in international politics is different. The Communists now have lined up enough countries to block U.N. intervention. The free world is inexplicably silent. Only by discussion and open criticism of the United Nations for its failure to solve the Viet Nam problem can any progress really be made.

The objective of such a crusade would be to secure acceptance of a plan whereby the U.N. would demand assurances from both Red China and the Soviet Union that they would cease their aid to the aggressors in North Viet Nam. If this were done, the U.N. could pledge itself to arrange for the withdrawal of American troops. The whole settlement could then be supervised under international auspices for an indefinite period. This procedure has been followed many times in recent history, and it can be tried again if world opinion insists upon it. The United States has an opportunity to mobilize the free world in order to utilize the U.N.'s "peace-keeping" powers in Viet Nam.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THIRD POWERPLANT AT GRAND COULEE DAM, COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT, WASHINGTON

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1761) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant with a rated capacity of approximately three million six hundred thousand kilowatts, and necessary appurtenant works, including a visitor center, at Grand Coulee Dam as an addition to and an integral part of the Columbia Basin Federal reclamation project. The construction cost of the third powerplant allocated to power and associated with each stage of development shall be repaid with interest within fifty years from the time that stage becomes revenue producing. The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid bal-

ance of the cost allocated to power shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the initial request for appropriations for the construction of the third powerplant is made, by computing the average interest rate payable by the Treasury on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States then outstanding which, upon original issue, had terms to maturity of fifteen years or more, and by adjusting such average rate to the next lowest multiple of one-eighth of one per centum.

(b) Construction of the third powerplant may be undertaken in such stages as in the determination of the Secretary will effectuate the fullest, most beneficial, and most economic utilization of the waters of the Columbia River.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall prepare, maintain, and present annually to the President and the Congress a consolidated financial statement for all projects heretofore or hereafter authorized, including the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam, from or by means of which commercial power and energy is marketed through the facilities of the Federal Columbia River power system and for all other projects associated therewith to the extent that the costs of these projects are required by law to be charged to and returned from net revenues derived from the power and energy, or any power and energy, so marketed, and he shall, if said consolidated statement indicates that the reimbursable construction costs of the projects, or any of the projects, covered thereby which are chargeable to and returnable from the commercial power and energy so marketed are likely not to be returned within the period prescribed by law, take prompt action to adjust the rates charged for such power and energy to the extent necessary to assure such return. Section 9, subsection (c) of the Act of August 20, 1937 (50 Stat. 736), as amended (16 U.S.C. 832h) is hereby repealed.

That portion of the construction cost of any project hereafter authorized to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior under the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) within the Pacific Northwest which, though allocated to irrigation, is beyond the ability of the irrigation water users to repay within the repayment period prescribed by law for that project and cannot be returned within the same period from other project sources of revenue shall be charged to and returned within that period from net revenues derived from the marketing of commercial power and energy through the Federal Columbia River power system, unless otherwise provided by law. As used in this Act, the term "Pacific Northwest" has the meaning ascribed to it in section 1 of the Act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 756).

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, for construction of the third powerplant and necessary appurtenant works including a visitor center at Grand Coulee Dam, the sum of \$390,000,000, based on estimated costs as of April 1966, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the third powerplant, when constructed, will make Grand Coulee Dam once again the world's largest hydroelectric project. To demonstrate his strong support, President Johnson took the unusual procedure in a bill of this nature of personally submitting the legislation to Congress in April of last year, and my Senior Colleague and I introduced it in the Senate. He advised the Congress in his January 1966 budget message that he is prepared to request funds to start construction immediately upon authorization.

Almost a year ago, the Senate passed S. 1761 without amendment other than a dollar limitation on the total amount of appropriations authorized. However, in acting on H.R. 7406, a companion bill to S. 1761, the House of Representatives amended it in several respects. I intend to ask that the Senate accept S. 1761 as amended by the House of Representatives.

The need for immediate authorization of the third powerplant, and its close relationship to the Columbia River Treaty between the United States and Canada, were thoroughly presented in hearings on S. 1761 last year before the Senate Interior Committee, and on the floor of the Senate when S. 1761 was unanimously passed. I am advised by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall that the need for the third powerplant, and its economic justification, are even greater today than appeared to be the case at the time of the Senate hearings. I will therefore direct my remarks today principally toward the amendments to S. 1761 adopted by the House of Representatives. Because certain of these amendments vitally concern both the power users of the Pacific Northwest, and the reclamationists of that region, I want the legislative history as to the intent of Congress in approving these amendments to be crystal clear.

Two of the House amendments concern the interest rate to be paid on the Federal investment in the third powerplant, and the dollar limitation on the appropriations authorized by the bill. Section 1 of H.R. 7406, as it passed the House, establishes as the formula for computing the interest rate on that part of the investment allocated to power the same formula as provided in Senate Document No. 97, 87th Congress, 2d session, and is substantially the same formula used elsewhere by the Department of the Interior in water resource development. It is also the same formula that the Bonneville Power Administration now follows, and the bill merely makes mandatory what Bonneville is already doing administratively. Section 3 of H.R. 7406 differs from S. 1761 by changing the dollar limitation on the total amount of appropriations authorized by the bill from \$364,310,000, based on April 1964 costs, to \$390 million, based on April 1966 costs.

professional health and retirement benefits. I want to see them backed up with the most modern equipment and facilities—and here let me put in a special word about precinct stations. Many are a shame and a disgrace. Policemen have to spend a lot of their working lives in these stations—and they should spend it in comfort and dignity.

I want Americans young and old, to trust and respect the man with the badge—not merely because he wears it, but because he wears it with honor.

Men of the National Academy, as you return home to resume rightful places of leadership and service in your communities, I ask that you carry proudly the torch of understanding earned during your 12 weeks of intensive study with the FBI. In the tradition of those who have preceded you across this graduation platform, use that torch to light beacons of knowledge and enlightenment and insight and truth—beacons of greater service to humanity.

PROPOSED UNIVERSAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE FOR YOUNG AMERICANS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, within the last few weeks, Secretary McNamara proposed that all young Americans give 2 years of their life to the Federal Government. Two Texas radio stations, KHOU of Houston, and KMHT of Marshall, have responded with editorials most quickly and most perceptively to this unfeasible proposal. These two editorials point out with awareness the consequences and the dissatisfaction that this unwise program would incur.

I ask unanimous consent that these two radio editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[An editorial from Houston, Tex., KHOU, May 23, 1966]

THIS IS A SOLUTION?

The latest brainstorm from Washington is simply unbelievable.

It's the proposal by the Secretary of Defense for all young Americans to give two years of their time to the federal government.

Proposed to answer complaints that college draft exemptions are unfair, it is a strange solution of surrender.

Beyond that, it is difficult to believe it is a serious suggestion.

In solving the college draft exemption problem, it would . . . for its first two years of operation, totally eliminate new college enrollments.

Based on Job Corps and Poverty Program experience, where it costs \$10,000 a year to take care of each youngster involved . . . and based on the statistics that more than 7 million youngsters reach the age of 18 every two years . . . it would cost more than \$70-billion a year to handle such a program—two-thirds of our present federal budget.

And the only answer to either problem would be to set up a system of exemptions . . . which would put us right back where we are now.

[An editorial from Marshall, Tex., radio station KMHT]

Robert McNamara, the U.S. Secretary of Defense, has come up with another typical jewel of his political philosophy. McNamara says he believes that every American youngster should be required to spend two years in service to the government, either in military service or a civilian job. This idea is about as well thought out as the decision to manufacture the Edsel.

A military draft we can understand, even though we all regret the necessity of calling young men to military service, but to force our youngsters to give up two years of their lives to work in some federal program that probably shouldn't exist in the first place does not make sense.

In time of war it is necessary to build up our armed forces quickly, and the draft is the only immediately apparent way to accomplish this end, but if there are not enough volunteers to staff the pet programs of our politicians, the programs should be curtailed or abolished.

The draft of youngsters into civilian governmental service will only be another step toward the regimentation of our young people.

This program deserves the whole-hearted, unqualified opposition of every loyal American.

ECONOMIC AID TO VIETNAM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, during recent months I have brought to the attention of the Senate what appears to be an unwise use of U.S. AID funds for economic assistance to Vietnam. As I have indicated previously, we have been purchasing Japanese made, Korean galvanized steel sheeting for Vietnam which has been of inferior quality at an inflated price.

If an article which appeared in the June 6, 1966, edition of U. S. News & World Report is correct, this is only one example of the misuse of economic aid which may have occurred. It is extremely difficult, Mr. President, to assist in developing the resources of a nation while its soil is being ravaged by war. It is even more difficult to do so when black marketeering, theft and corruption apparently take place on the scale which has been reported.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article from the U.S. News & World Report, together with an editorial commenting on the purchase of galvanized sheet steel for Vietnam, which appeared in the Richmond, Va., Palladium-Item on May 23, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the U.S. News & World Report, June 6, 1966]

A WAR WHERE U.S. SUPPLIES ARE GETTING TO BOTH SIDES

(Reported from Saigon and Washington)

It's another strange aspect of a frustrating war. Vast amounts of U.S. supplies are winding up in Communist hands.

A stepped-up effort to curb the flow is under way. But widespread corruption in South Vietnam makes it a tough job.

Corruption on a huge scale is turning out to be a vital ally of the Communists in Vietnam.

Graft, theft, black-marketing are common to every war. But what makes this war different is that corruption is channeling to the enemy enormous amounts of materials paid for by U.S. taxpayers and needed in the fight against the Viet Cong.

Meanwhile, Vietnamese who find it profitable to trade with the enemy are getting richer and richer at the expense of the U.S.

What is described as a "sizzling" report on misuse of the U.S. economic aid program in Vietnam is expected from a subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee.

BONANZA FOR VIET CONG

The subcommittee—convinced that "hundreds of millions of dollars' worth" of supplies financed by the U.S. Agency for International Development have been diverted to the Viet Cong—went to South Vietnam during May for an on-the-spot investigation.

On their return to Washington, some members of the subcommittee were outspoken in charging laxity of controls over the AID's commodity-import program. That program accounts for 370 million dollars of the 641 million in U.S. economic aid going to Vietnam in the year to end June 30, 1966. Cost of the commodity-import program for the year beginning July 1 is estimated at 420 million. Combined military and economic assistance will be running at a billion dollars or more.

WHAT'S BEING STOLEN

In Vietnam such examples of costly "leakage" as these are cited:

Cement, steel, drainage tiles and aluminum roofing paid for by the U.S. are diverted to the Viet Cong and wind up in Communist fortifications, field hospitals and camps.

Steel pipe, shipped from the U.S., is acquired by the Communists who use it for mortar barrels or for the outer shells of terrorist bombs.

U.S.-made radios, parts and tubes assist Red communications networks. American-financed medicines or drugs save the lives of wounded Viet Cong.

How do the Communists get these and other items?

The answer is: In a variety of ways. Material is stolen from docks by Viet Cong agents or by thieves who sell it to Viet Cong representatives operating under cover. Goods going into regular channels of trade are sold to the Viet Cong—knowingly or unknowingly. Vietnamese guards at docks or warehouses often can be bribed.

Viet Cong agents in Saigon mastermind smuggling operations in which materials are transported to the Reds via the river and canal system that radiates from the capital into the delta.

IF VILLAGE CHIEF SAYS "NO"

Diversion of construction materials, such as cement, generally takes place on the district level. An example of one way it is done: A project to build a school, marketplace or village well is approved. When construction supplies arrive, the Viet Cong underground demands that 5 per cent or 10 per cent of them be diverted to the Communist guerrillas. If the district of village chief refuses, he or his family is killed.

What is being done to curb this costly flow of U.S.-financed materials to the Viet Cong? The answer you get in Saigon is that attempts to tighten controls are bringing some efficiency, but that much more needs to be done.

Take the problem of pharmaceuticals. There are 3,000 outlets in Saigon alone. In theory, drugs are sold only in limited quantities—such as 200 penicillin tablets—and only upon presentation of identity cards. But most stores have ignored the regulations. Now police in plain clothes spot-check stores at intervals. Storekeepers found violating the regulations are jailed.

Vigilance at road checkpoints is increasing. Almost daily, individuals are nabbed carrying contraband items or too much currency. In a recent interception on the outskirts of Saigon, mobile police seized a truck carrying 250 rolls of electric wire, 200 shovels, 15 sheets of brass, a carton of antibiotics, a case of printing materials and two tape recorders.

Canals and rivers now are being patrolled by South Vietnam's first squadron of river police, operating small, fast U.S.-made boats. Day by day, the number of suspected smugglers' junks searched is increasing and the haul of intercepted contraband is rising.

PHREY, gave the main address before the graduates of the 77th session of the Academy.

Courageous, efficient law enforcement is one of the many blessings which we Americans have come to take for granted. It is achieved only at great personal sacrifice by men of selfless devotion to duty—men of valor and virtue too seldom recognized and too seldom extolled.

These are the words of the Vice President, who then went on to say that "in a democracy such as ours, the preservation of law and order begins with the individual. Within the limit of his capabilities, every American has an obligation not only to uphold the law, but to support it with all reasonable means at his command."

In other words, each of us must give our full support and encouragement, on a continuing basis, to our law enforcement officials.

Without this, the best training and the highest dedication to duty will not meet and master the serious crime and enforcement problems we face today.

I ask unanimous consent that this inspiring address by our distinguished Vice President be printed in the RECORD so that my colleagues will have a chance to read it.

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

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT THE GRADUATION EXERCISES OF THE FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 25, 1966

It is indeed a pleasure to participate in this graduation ceremony of the FBI National Academy—a professional training school which has had a profound effect upon law enforcement.

When Director Hoover founded this Academy in 1935, the skeptics far outnumbered those who thought that such an advanced, formal training program for law enforcement officers could succeed.

Today, as evidenced by the graduates of this 77th Session, the FBI National Academy enjoys a position not only of national, but of international respect and prestige.

This is but one of the many achievements of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI.

During his 42 years as head of the Bureau, J. Edgar Hoover has made a truly outstanding record of public service.

More than any other American, he is responsible for creating a new image of the law enforcement officer—an image well expressed by the motto of this Academy: "Knowledge, Courage, Integrity."

I am delighted to see a friend of long standing, Inspector Donald Dwyer of Minneapolis Police Department, among the 100 outstanding men receiving diplomas today.

I am delighted also to see representatives from Chile, Argentina, Japan, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and the United Arab Republic—as well as the Virgin Islands—in this graduating class. Director Hoover has told me how much these officers have contributed to the success of the 77th Session.

I can think of no greater reward for their efforts over the past 12 weeks than the accurate impression of American law enforcement—not only its equipment, procedures and techniques, but also its forthright principles and the high caliber of leadership—which these visiting officers have obtained from the National Academy program and from their association with the other outstanding men, representing 39 states, on the roster of this class.

Courageous, efficient law enforcement is one of the many blessings which we Americans have come to take for granted. It is achieved only at great personal sacrifice by men of selfless devotion to duty—men of valor and virtue too seldom recognized and too seldom extolled.

Since I first came to Washington as a Senator, I have had occasion to travel extensively as an official representative of the United States.

In country after country, I have found that one of the most reliable barometers of the true national atmosphere is the attitude of the people toward their law enforcement agencies.

Are they looked upon as public servants, or as instruments to suppress the public will?

Here in America we have found that it is not enough for the law enforcement agency to win the respect of the people. That respect has to be maintained and strengthened. It is here that the special police units for human relations or community relations—the titles vary—have such a timely and essential job to do. The officers who head them, and the policemen who man them, have a difficult and highly responsible assignment, and they must be carefully selected and trained.

We do confront a very serious problem in the enforcement of the law, and we shall need the widest possible public support to meet and master it.

Since 1958, crime has risen six times as fast as our national population.

Last year alone, more than 2,700,000 serious crimes were reported to police departments throughout the United States. That is an all-time record. It means not only that more crimes are being committed, but that the victims of crime are mounting at a greater rate than ever before.

I do not have to tell the members of this National Academy class that a disproportionate number of victims come from the ranks of law enforcement—particularly the local police.

Last year alone, more than 80 law enforcement officers gave their lives in line of duty—53 of them killed by dangerous felons and gunmen.

Only last week an FBI agent was tragically slain—the 20th to give his life in the service of the Bureau.

Thousands of other law enforcement officers came to physical harm last year. Statistics compiled by the FBI clearly show that, year after year, about one of every 10 police officers is the victim of violent assault. Too often, this assault is carried out before the eyes of impassive bystanders who are otherwise responsible citizens.

This is deeply disturbing. For, in a democracy such as ours, the preservation of law and order begins with the individual. Within the limit of his capabilities, every American has an obligation not only to uphold the law, but to support it with all reasonable means at his command.

What specifically does this mean? It means taking a genuine interest in the problems of crime and in the obstacles—legal, budgetary or otherwise—confronting honest, impartial, effective crime control.

It means responding to the call of jury duty; willingly appearing as a witness in criminal proceedings; promptly reporting the facts concerning violations of law; and, most fundamental of all, conscientiously observing both the letter and the spirit of the law.

Every American does have a very important stake in the proper enforcement of law. At times this personal interest is more obvious than at others—for example, when a particularly atrocious murder or beating sends a shock wave of fear throughout a community and captures local headlines.

However, indignation has a tendency to be short-lived. All but those most personally affected tend to quickly forget. The principle that every act of crime is a public

wrong, a menace to the body politic, soon slips from view.

Many years ago, a wise man of Athens was asked when he believed injustice would be abolished. Let me quote for you his apt reply. It will be abolished, he said, "when those who are not wronged wax as indignant as those who are."

I assure you that this Administration fully recognizes its responsibility for urgent and effective action against crime. In a special message to Congress last year, President Johnson outlined a three-pronged attack upon crime and lawlessness.

This message constituted a call to action—and action did follow, including the passage and the signing into law of measures such as the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, through which millions of dollars of federal funds are being channeled into worthwhile state and local police uses, and the appointment of a President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.

In March of this year, the President submitted a second message to Congress on the topic of crime and law enforcement.

I was delighted to observe, Director Hoover, that the FBI National Academy occupies a position of prominence in that message. The President reported to Congress that a six-fold expansion of the National Academy is currently being planned. Following construction of your new Academy building at Quantico, Virginia, 1,200 law enforcement officers—rather than the present maximum of 200—will be able to participate each year in this outstanding training course.

The Administration has also taken measures to prevent crime—an aspect of law enforcement which progressive police departments have been stressing for many years.

The war on poverty which the President launched two years ago is being planned and administered to eradicate the stagnant pools of bitterness and frustration which breed much of our present-day crime.

The historic measures enacted last year to support elementary and secondary education have, as their principal objective, helping to make our schools useful, meaningful and worthwhile to poor and educationally-handicapped children—so that fewer of them will join the ranks of the "drop-outs" from which so many juvenile delinquents are recruited.

Some of you may have heard about crime in Washington. I think that you will be pleased to hear that the incidence of serious crime in this city has been falling, in comparison with last year's levels, ever since November.

I congratulate Chief Layton and his men for their effective work. But I think some of the credit also belongs to the anti-poverty programs which began to take hold last summer, to the reduction of over-crowding in our schools, and the less restrictive administration of our public welfare system.

Action against the conditions which lead to crime does help.

But law enforcement officers are still, as President Johnson has said, our "frontline soldiers in the war against crime."

They deserve the full support of the community—moral and material.

I don't merely preach this. As Mayor of Minneapolis two decades ago I practiced it.

When I took office, underworld influence was strong in the city. I called the church, business, and other civic leaders together, and I said:

"I want your backing. I can't clean up this city alone. I want to be able to pay the best policemen the best salaries we can, because we simply can't afford anything less than the best."

They did in fact back me up. And we did get a clean police force and a clean city.

I want to see our law enforcement officers paid at a professional level, and with pro-

June 2, 1966

For the first time, there is evidence of co-operation and hard work by the U.S. and South Vietnamese Governments in efforts that cut across the entire spectrum of corruption that has grown to enormous proportions since the massive build-up of U.S. power began more than a year ago.

An economic-warfare committee, set up by the U.S. to advise the Vietnamese Government, became operational in March. When all authorized posts are filled, more than 200 American experts will be working exclusively on the economic war. Serving in this force are former FBI agents, U.S. customs officers on loan, Treasury Department men, Government auditors and controllers.

So far, the committee has had two major successes. It started investigations that halted shipments of Unicel-100 and silver nitrate that could have aided the Viet Cong.

Unicel-100, a chemical compound developed by an American firm, is mixed with rubber to make a pliable substance used in manufacturing sandals. Ten tons had been imported—enough to make 500,000 slippers, the maximum capacity of Vietnamese plants working full time for 18 months. Several times as much tonnage was aboard ships bound for Saigon when an AID official, suspicious of the large quantities ordered, demanded a check on the chemical qualities of the material.

The check disclosed that Unicel-100 in its pure state had an explosive power equal to that of TNT.

The economic-warfare committee became suspicious of the large quantities of silver nitrate being imported for "film processing." Committee officials who speak Chinese visited Chinese firms in Saigon that had bought the compound. They discovered that the Chinese were "cooking" the silver nitrate and extracting 5.8 pounds of pure silver from 10 pounds of the compound.

This was extremely profitable for the Chinese—but there was another, and grimmer, disclosure. The nitrate left over from the cooking could easily be converted to explosives for making bombs and the Claymore mines used by Viet Cong terrorists in Saigon. As a result of the investigation, shipments of silver nitrate valued at more than a million dollars were halted.

Now, the economic-warfare group is combing the entire list of commodity imports, searching for items that might help the Communists.

PROFITEERING ON U.S. FUNDS

The committee's primary function is to deprive the Viet Cong of things they need to keep going. But it also is involved in actions to prevent misuse of AID funds, waste of American aid goods, black-market profiteering and illegal currency transactions.

Stealing from U.S. stockpiles has been cut down by more extensive use of armed guards. American military officials say that the black market in goods stolen or otherwise improperly obtained from post exchanges is dwindling as a result of a sharp crackdown.

The crackdown on the black market in U.S. dollars is more difficult. Although American servicemen now are paid in scrip, not cash, soldiers who go to Hong Kong, Bangkok or Singapore on leave can get dollars there. In the Saigon black market run by Chinese and Indian currency dealers, servicemen can get 160 to 170 Vietnamese piastres for a dollar bill, but only 118 for scrip exchanged for piastres on their bases.

Just recently, a U.S. soldier was caught smuggling in \$7,000 in greenbacks. Since November, 1964, a total of 148 Americans—military men and civilians—faced investigation in connection with illegal currency manipulations. The U.S. Internal Revenue Service has dispatched agents to Saigon to look into tax aspects of black-market dealings.

Defense Department files show that a number of American civilians, including some employees of defense contractors, have left Vietnam with unexplained sums ranging from \$11,000 to \$42,000. The IRS is investigating tax returns of these people.

It's admitted in Saigon that profiteering and black-marketing by the Vietnamese themselves and by importers of various other nationalities are almost impossible to control.

Importers make tremendous profits, because goods are imported at rates varying from 40 to 118 piastres to the dollar and sold at fantastically inflated prices. Imported goods are supposed to be price-controlled, but machinery for effective control is lacking.

The economic-warfare committee says that it is curbing another aspect of corruption—misuse of AID funds in payment of exorbitant prices for items purchased in Taiwan, Korea and Hong Kong. Those governments are prosecuting sellers of lathes, bulldozers and other equipment that did not pass quality and price checks in Saigon. Importers in Saigon are being questioned about "kickbacks."

On a related matter, Senator BIRCH BAYH, Democrat, of Indiana, declared in Washington:

"The prices paid by Vietnam with AID financing for inferior products were outrageously exorbitant. * * *

"While Korea was selling a galvanized ton of 32-gauge sheet steel to Vietnam for \$260 plus shipping and handling, it was buying black plate from Japan for \$140 a ton.

"Thus, Korea was adding about \$120 a ton for galvanizing and handling. Now most American companies—using twice the amount of zinc per square foot and paying their labor many times what Korean laborers are paid—charge approximately \$60 to \$70 a ton for galvanizing sheet steel.

"The reason for this odd circumstance is enshrined in documents currently classified as secret. Suffice it to say, however, that a system of kickbacks, collusion and corruption is at the root of the problem."

American officials concede that, at best, profiteering by Vietnamese Government personnel, even some Army officers, can only be curtailed, not ended.

For one thing, in Vietnam as in the rest of Asia, the "squeeze" is a way of life, more so than ever when men on relatively low pay are trapped in a highly inflationary economy.

It's easy to bribe a policeman to overlook possession of black-market items. It's easy to bribe an official to issue an import license.

Big, French-owned import firms and Vietnamese-Chinese companies know how much "squeeze" to pay for high priority in getting ships unloaded and getting goods through customs.

GRAFT IN THE PROVINCES

Corruption is traditional in district governments. A Vietnamese district chief can pad payrolls and pocket the pay of phantom workers. Province chiefs can do the same on a bigger scale—and also extract kickbacks from district bosses.

Charges are made that Vietnamese Army officers use their troops and AID materials to build houses which they then rent at high rates to Americans.

In Vietnam, family relationships are so intricate and loyalties so interwoven that few Vietnamese Government officials or military officers will move to expose corrupt associates.

There is no tradition that the law transcends personal relationships.

It is inflation that is largely blamed for the breakdown of morality and the rapid increase in corruption that is proving to be a valuable ally of the Communists in Vietnam.

In the years since 1960 the South Vietnamese Government's expenditures on the civilian side have doubled, while in the same period military expenditures have increased

sixfold. The Government's deficit, 16.4 billion piastres in 1964, jumped to 26.7 billion piastres last year. The deficit was covered by printing-press money.

This year, Government income from the U.S. AID program will exceed the total of other national revenues. Pressure is added by the U.S. military-construction program which this year, in cumulative total, will pass the billion-dollar mark. The average GI in Vietnam spends about \$40 on goods and services each month. That adds to the inflationary pressure.

U.S. HOPE: CUT IN CORRUPTION

As U.S. officials see it, as long as a program of such size continues, not much can be done about small-scale corruption.

What the U. S. hopes is that efforts now being pressed in a big way can halt the major corruption that plays into the hands of the enemy—and slow down appreciably dispersal of U. S. AID material to the Viet Cong.

[From the Richmond, (Ind.) Palladium-Item, May 23, 1966]

BAYH'S CHARGES UPHELD

After two and a half months the Agency for International Development (AID) has finally admitted that Senator BIRCH BAYH was correct in his charge that it was buying inferior Japanese-made and Korean-galvanized steel sheeting.

The sheeting was purchased for use in Viet Nam and BAYH had charged in late February that it "has been rotting out in less than a year" whereas American steel "lasts about 12 years."

AID Deputy Administrator William S. Gaud admitted also that "with respect to prices, we found indications of possible collusion and kickbacks by suppliers to Vietnamese buyers."

A release from the office of Indiana's junior Democratic senator said, "This was AID's first public acknowledgement of the accuracy of BAYH's charges." It earlier denied any collusion.

Gaud said future purchases of steel sheeting will have to meet U.S. commercial standards and that half of it must be purchased in the United States. "We also will set reasonable price ceilings above which awards will not be made," Gaud promised.

Formerly 90 per cent of American foreign aid funds for such products as galvanized steel had to be spent in the U.S. but on Jan. 31, AID waived this rule for galvanized steel.

BAYH wants all pregalvanized steel to be purchased in this country. He plans to push an amendment to the 1967 foreign aid bill for that purpose.

He is willing as a reward for Seoul's active support in the war in Viet Nam to let Korean firms continue to galvanize the sheeting if they upgrade to American standards.

BAYH was alert in being concerned when AID-financed purchases of inferior steel were affecting the jobs of 80,000 Indian steel workers whose taxes help support AID.

AID bungled when it agreed to buy foreign sheeting without first checking its quality. Even if the foreign sheeting were equal to American steel, its purchase, as BAYH pointed out, aggravates the unfavorable U.S. balance of trade.

The profiteering on foreign galvanized steel is another example of American tax money dispensed without adequate controls or supervision. AID is funneling \$370 million into South Viet Nam this year but has only two persons checking to see how the money is spent.

While AID officials are finally moving to prevent the waste now that Senator BAYH has made it hot for them, there is no excuse for previous lack of concern. American and South Vietnamese troops have been dying

while AID has allowed U.S. funds to be squandered and siphoned off by profiteers.

THE ROLE OF PACKAGING IN THE ECONOMY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a most interesting, and timely study of the role of packaging in the U.S. economy has recently been published. Undertaken by Arthur D. Little, Inc. for the American Foundation for Management Research, the study sheds new light on the value of packaging to the total economy and its place in our consumer-oriented market.

The study shows that the value of packaging to consumers is increasing, despite the relative decline in industry spending for packaging. It indicates that packaging has a long-term salutary effect on general economic health because it reduces production and marketing costs, increases consumer demand for products, and accelerates the rate of market penetration.

These conclusions derived from the work of one of the Nation's most respected research organizations, should be especially interesting to the Senate as it considers the so-called truth in packaging bill, some parts of which are based on the philosophy that packaging is a dark-hued villian intent on robbing the defenseless housewife. This survey may help to set the record straight. Unfortunately it is too lengthy, 113 pages, to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but the magazine *Modern Packaging* has published a useful summation of the report's major findings and conclusions, which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From *Modern Packaging*, May 1966]

PACKAGING: A GIANT MATURES

Impartial report gives statistical proof of packaging's contributions to the nation's economic growth and to corporate profits and shows how it is increasing value of the consumer's food dollar.

A long-awaited "white paper" on packaging's contributions to the U.S. economy has just been released. Some of its findings may surprise; others reinforce the validity of profit philosophies that have been translated into action by many of the nation's leading packagers and suppliers. Among the report's major conclusions:

The value of packaging to consumers is increasing—despite claims to the contrary by proponents of tighter Federal controls over packaging and labeling. Packaging is, in fact, reducing consumer purchase and consumption risk to "an historic low."

Packaging is not growing quite as fast as the U.S. economy as a whole, indicating that it has become a mature service vital to general economic health.

The over-all value of packaging, currently pegged at \$22 billion, should grow to \$29 billion by 1975.

The level of packaging prices corresponds closely with the general wholesale-price index.

So vital an influence is packaging on corporate profits that the packaging function must be considered as a centralized management-level responsibility.

Despite the onrush of plastics, most traditional materials are maintaining a steady share of market.

These data are contained in an impartial statistical survey by Arthur D. Little, Inc., titled "The Role of Packaging in the U.S. Economy," made by the research firm for the American Foundation for Management Research, a non-profit affiliate of the American Management Assn. Covering the decade from 1954 to 1963, it is the end product of broad-scope interviews among suppliers, package users, industry associations and Government agencies. Detailed analyses of economic aspects of the report will appear in forthcoming issues of *MODERN PACKAGING*.

It remains to be seen what effect this economic report will have on such pending legislation as the Hart Bill, which is predicated on the assumption that much of packaging does a disservice to American consumers. Little's study makes a contrary case. It reveals that consumers spent an average of \$5.01 for packaging-materials per \$100 of food-product purchases in 1963, compared with \$5.14 per \$100 in 1954. During the same decade, consumer earning power rose sharply. The report concludes, therefore, that "the combined effect of this rise in consumer earnings and a continued stability in packaging-material prices has meant that the consumer received nearly 25% more value for his packaging dollar in 1963 than he did in 1954, and nearly 30% more in 1963 than in 1958."

A further caution against applying check-reins to packaging is implied in the survey finding that packaging has a long-term salutary effect on general economic health because it reduces production and marketing costs, increases consumer demand for products and accelerates the rate of market penetration.

The fact that packaging is not growing quite as fast as Gross National Product (4.2% annually for the former, 5.6% for the latter during the period 1958-63) is proof that packaging has matured as a service in the U.S. economy, according to the report. The reasons given for the slower growth rate of packaging are (1) distribution of packaging materials over major market segments has remained relatively constant over the past decade; (2) unexploited opportunities for packaging are fewer today, and (3) as the economy becomes more geared to mass consumption, spending for services increases and the portion of total spending for packaged products declines.

An interesting note on the distribution of packaging materials is that such old standbys as metal, glass, paper and paperboard did not lose ground in the decade between 1954 and 1963—even though plastic materials doubled in volume, from 2.7% to 5.8% of the total packaging market.

Packaging's role in fostering corporate success gets a big boost from the survey. It urges that management recognize the need to centralize the packaging function in corporate strategy and decision-making, rather than delegate responsibility to one sector or another of the corporation—each with its own biases. Only by broad-spectrum management control, the report concludes, can the potential of packaging be realized fully.

Copies of the full report, at \$2.75, are available from the American Foundation for Management Research, Inc., 135 W. 50 St., New York 10020.

GIANT RESEARCH TOOL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of the Senate the dedication last Sunday, May 28, in Columbia, Mo., of the most powerful university research reactor in the country.

The completion of this reactor is a great step forward for the development

of high level research in Missouri. It is clear evidence that Missouri is willing and able to shoulder the responsibilities of the nation's major research needs.

Five times more powerful than the second ranking reactor—which is at Massachusetts Institute of Technology—the new reactor at Columbia represents a new design concept. With an output of 10 megawatts-thermal, it is more powerful than several industrial testing reactors, and more powerful than several of the Atomic Energy Commission's own research reactors.

The policy of the University concerning use of the reactor is that:

The research reactor facility shall be available for research utilization by any member of the faculty of the University of Missouri and of the Universities comprising the Mid-America Association of State Universities. Priorities for the use by faculty members of any specialized facilities shall be established by the simple technique of "who asked first." In the event that questions arise as to the advisability of such a priority assignment, these questions will be negotiated with the Reactor Advisory Committee and their findings shall be final."

With respect to faculty, graduate students, other educational institutions and industry, the priority of use shall be as follows:

First. Faculty and graduate students of the University of Missouri and other universities in the Mid-America Association of State Universities.

Second. Faculty and graduate students of other educational institutions.

Third. Faculty and graduate students from out-of-State educational institutions.

Fourth. Industrial contract research.

I would like to point out that the university policy also says that wherever possible the research reactor and its facilities will be available to industrial users, where the industrial research will further teaching and academic programs. I find it an interesting and progressive step that the University is ready to consider participation by industry to the extent it is compatible with educational research activities. The blending of industrial and academic research in many ways can open the way to fruitful new combinations of ideas, new insights that can bring both scientific and technological progress.

The university is fortunate to have as Director of the Research Reactor Facility, Dr. Ardath H. Emmons, who is also a professor of nuclear engineering and a professor of radiology. He was born in Albert Lea, Minn., on March 12, 1924. He took his bachelors of Science in chemistry at Dubuque in 1948, his master's in chemistry at the University of Michigan in 1954 and his Ph.D. there in 1960. On February 1, 1960, he was appointed to the faculty of the university. Since then he has been a pivotal figure in bringing this reactor project into reality.

Many companies from Missouri have had an important part in bringing the reactor into being. The Internuclear Co. of St. Louis did the preliminary design study, the design and the specification writing. It also prepared the studies and reports required by the Atomic Energy Commission to justify the AEC's issuing

June 2, 1966

11488

The Federal Water Projects Recreation Act of 1965 is designed to give full consideration to outdoor recreation and to fish and wildlife enhancement in connection with federal water resource projects.

An amendment, also in 1965, to Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, increases the authorized floodwater detention capacity of reservoirs built under this upstream watershed program from 5,000 to 12,500 acre-feet. This increase enables communities, in developing the resources of their watersheds, to utilize storage sites more in keeping with their potential, without reducing the level of flood protection provided.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 amends the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 to give it added strength and to create the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. This Administration has now been transferred from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to the Department of Interior.

There are two interesting proposals now before Congress which fit into our overall interests. These are, first, the Clean Rivers Restoration Bills (S. 2987 and H.R. 13104), which would provide for the cleaning of entire river basins, with maximum cooperation by all levels of government. This program would have for its ultimate objective the restoration of selected rivers to an adequate standard of water quality for future health, welfare and resource needs.

The other is the Wild Rivers Bill, which would provide for retaining in perpetuity certain, still-unspoiled stretches of our more scenic and inspiring streams.

Chronologically, the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80) should be higher in the list I have read, but I purposely saved it to last. This act bears the date July 22, 1965, and it establishes a Water Resources Council, made up of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Army, Interior, Health-Education-Welfare and the chairman of the Federal Power Commission. (The Secretary of the Interior has been designated by the President as Council chairman.)

This law provides for the establishment, by the President, of River Basin Commissions on request by the Council, or by a concerned state in a basin, with concurrence by the Council, if at least half of the concerned states wholly or partly in the basin concur. It provides for the appropriation of federal funds to be allotted to states to finance increased participation by the states in water and related land resources planning.

The River Basin Commissions will be made up of representatives of the concerned states and of the federal agencies involved, with the chairman (who will not be an employee of a federal agency) to be named by the President.

Requests for the establishment of commissions under this act have been received from the governors of the New England States and from the governors of the Great Lakes States. Similar requests are in process by other groups of states.

The budgets of the various agencies involved in comprehensive river basin investigation and planning were coordinated for several years by the ad hoc Water Resources Council in continuing this necessary procedure for assuring that all concerned agencies participate in an adequate and timely manner in such studies.

So, our strides out of the maze of difficulties, which we have as a nation created for ourselves, have been long and swift; but we have made only a beginning. We have far to go.

The challenges we face as we go forward toward our objective in river basin work are by no means beyond our successful response.

One of them, as I see it, is to overcome the apathy, the human inertia, we encounter as we consider basin development needs and potentials. We find still those who do not

yet see the need for our efforts and expenditures to protect, preserve and develop our basin resources for the America of 1980 and the year 2000. Understanding by the people in these basins, now and in the future, of the benefits that will accrue from wise planning of our water and related land resources and from installation of needed improvements will clear the way for the teamwork we must have.

We face the challenge to engage the entire cross-section of interests in a basin in the development of a plan. Local participation and cooperation are essential. The plan must represent the concern, the vision and the imagination of many people, and it must be a product of the democratic process in its preparation and its final form. As I suggested at the recent Oklahoma SCS convention in Tulsa, the soil conservation district may well be the vehicle which can bring about this participation by local interests, watershed by watershed, and district by district, down to the last acre, the last home or factory site, or playground, the last creek and rivulet.

We face the challenge of bringing together the interests far upstream with those far downstream and of making sure that, in the upstream planning, we are not focusing our attention on a single purpose, such as flood prevention, when there are many other values to be considered. We face an unending challenge in making sure that in all our work in river basin planning and development we do not lose sight of the basic purpose of our efforts—to accomplish these things, in basin and watershed, for the total good.

Senate Document No. 97 (May 29, 1962) states it this way:

"The basic objective in this planning is to provide the best use, or combination of uses, of water and related land use resources to meet all foreseeable short and long-term needs."

John Graves, described in the Interim Report on the Potomac as "one of the fine river historians of our country," writes in his own appraisal of the river's plight in these words:

"The Potomac Basin, well-watered and reasonably rich and agreeably varied, has few problems aside from modern man; one might almost say aside from modernized man . . . By hard concerted thinking and effort and desire and the expenditure of money, the Basin can be cleaned up and protected for a while. In a country that can muster the brain and cash to shoot for the moon, it will be a dark shame if this is not done, along the Potomac and everywhere else there is a good piece of country to save for people's decent living and wholeness."

"Yet finally and again it is necessary to note that anything we do for the Potomac Basin or any other place, at whatever effort and whatever expense, will be temporary if we keep trotting down our present casual road toward numbers and nothingness. No river or piece of country is going to be able to stand the kind of pressure that will generate, and it is fairly certain that we won't be able to stand it ourselves."

This, too, is one of our challenges in our concept of the cleaning, the repairing and the improvement of our nation's basin resources—to keep our work in place, our achievement sufficiently appreciated by our children and their children—and the generations beyond—so that our basins can remain safe, beautiful and fully usable.

Everyone in this audience this morning realizes very well that we can no longer afford to be complacent regarding the resources of our basins, for these are the values upon which our very existence as a nation depends. Our living standard is the marvel of the world, and our fabulous natural resources have been its foundation. We have too often been heedless and wanton in our use of these resources, but now our eyes are

open. It is late, but not too late. Demands upon our resources will increase, but we have the know-how and the advances in technology and science to come to grips with our basin problems.

Oliver Wendell Holmes pointed out that it is not so much where we stand that is important. It is where we are going.

I am confident that our nation's natural resources are in safe hands. We are going to meet the challenges of the 1960's in the use and development of our basin resources with intelligence and confidence.

There will come a day when we will be able to look down from the air upon any watershed, no matter where we may be, and see a countryside secure and beautiful. Trees will be where they should be, and grass will be where it should be. Cropland will be protected by all the needed conservation measures. Streams will be clean and clear, their flow steady and abundant. Recreation areas will be where our people can enjoy them. And, most important, the people who dwell in these places will be healthy, strong, keen of mind and happy—because man and nature will be in harmony.

This organization, and the organizations you represent here in this Congress, have made vast contributions to our progress in dealing with the problems of our basin resources. No one realizes more than you the importance of it, and the challenges we face. I congratulate you on what you have done in stimulating our thought and lending us guidance, and I wish you continued success in your vital efforts.

MORE AMERICAN STEEL IN VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last March 10, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] submitted an amendment to H.R. 12169, the supplemental appropriation act for Vietnam, which was adopted by the Senate, but eliminated in conference.

The amendment proposed to correct existing AID practices which resulted in the purchase of Japanese steel, galvanized in Korea, at a cost considerably higher but with lower quality than comparable steel could be purchased in the United States.

At that time, I stated my support of the position of the Senator from Indiana and urged the unanimous approval of that amendment.

It has come to my attention that the Iron Age magazine has printed an article in the April 28, 1966, issue which describes the continuing efforts of the Senator from Indiana to assure an appropriate change in AID policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Senator BAYH Urges Use of More American Steel in Vietnam."

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

SENATOR BAYH URGES USE OF MORE AMERICAN STEEL IN VIETNAM

Sen. BIRCH BAYH (D., Ind.) continues to exert pressure for a diversion of Vietnam steel production from foreign to U.S. mills.

Steel products purchased by Vietnam with U.S. aid dollars should contain 90% U.S.-made components, BAYH demands. He urges the Agency for International Development to change its present policy. This policy now allows the Vietnam government to buy foreign galvanized steel sheet from foreign suppliers and pay for it with AID funds.

June 2, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11487

essential... if we are to get enough water in the next 20 years."

A paragraph or so later in his book Senator Kerr warned:

"The mobilization will require the participation of all levels of government, guided and aided by an alert, informed citizenry. The people in each locality must work together to fit their own projects into the broader pattern."

The Senator and so many of you had seen the distress of the drought years, and in 1943 he had witnessed, as had many others of us, the tragedy of a mighty disaster on the Arkansas River. He had watched the repeated floods on the two branches of the Canadian River, and he was thoroughly abreast of the long and determined fight by the people in the Washita River watershed to control the frequent flooding and to develop that rich resource into an obedient and useful servant.

So, it was a natural consequence that, as Governor of Oklahoma, he would come to have an unyielding determination to lead the people of his state into a program which would lessen the harm of drought and flood and produce continuing benefits through conservation and development of basin and watershed values.

Only a few months ago, the President of the United States, addressing the International Symposium of Desalination, pointed out that fresh water has been one of humanity's most precious needs. Wars have been fought for it throughout history, he said, and without it whole civilizations have vanished from the earth; and he added that over various areas of the world today water is the key to man's prosperity or poverty.

As a member of our State Senate in Oklahoma for eight years, it was my privilege to have a part in the conservation progress we have made in this state, to the work of our soil conservation districts and the landowners who are cooperating with them toward the conservation, use, and development of our land, water, plant and wildlife resources. And I'm proud to have an opportunity to continue that interest and effort as a member of the Senate of the United States, its Committee on Public Works and its Subcommittees on Air and Water Pollution and Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control.

You will find our people here in Oklahoma heartily in accord with the programs we have under way, a majority thoroughly conversant with the problems that we have faced and the things we must do and are doing to correct them. It has been an effort of teamwork, not only throughout the levels of government, but, more importantly, among the many groups and interests of our citizens.

Earlier, I mentioned the Washita project. This was one of 11 authorized by the Congress in 1944 for the Department of Agriculture, under the leadership of the Soil Conservation Service and with the help of the Forest Service and other federal and state agencies, to carry on a special program of flood prevention and accelerated land treatment, with cost-sharing and technical assistance to help the local people with their flood problems.

Many of you know the story of the Washita, how the people over the years had struggled for some kind of control program, hoping at first for a system of big reservoirs to contain the floodwaters. Then when they had heard the new proposal and had studied it carefully, they agreed that it offered a most practical solution for their dilemma.

And so it has been. That day near Cordell, when the first of the floodwater retarding dams in the Washita project was dedicated—my distinguished senior colleague, Senator Mike Monroney, took part in that ceremony—was an important day for Oklahoma, and for the nation.

The story of Sandstone Creek farther up the watershed in western Oklahoma has become widely known also. It was the first of the small, creek-size watersheds in the Washita to be given full-dress treatment for the reduction of flooding, through a system of floodwater dams and conservation treatment of the drainage area.

Most of you know this story—how the flooding was reduced so that it has been of little consequence, how the creek that once stayed dry most months of the year has been flowing a steady, sparkling stream, how the people in that area now enjoy the recreational advantages this development affords, and how the well-being of an entire community has enjoyed a tremendous uplift as a result of this joint investment by the people and their government. This is a story that my friend L. L. (Red) Males, long a supervisor of the Upper Washita Soil Conservation District, has told hundreds of times throughout the nation. It is a story that grows more in significance as the years pass.

On the national level we are engaged now in a unique program on the Potomac River Basin. The President on February 8, 1965, directed the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a plan to make the Potomac "a model of conservation." That is being done in cooperation with other federal, local and state agencies.

In the Potomac, a river which should be a demonstration project for all those Americans and those from foreign lands who visit our nation's capitol, we have an example of what has happened to many of our beautiful streams and of what is now happening to many others in this country. Year by year, decade by decade, it has been going on—the ruining of a river through an amazing shortsightedness and the complete absence of any thought to planning. It would have cost us in taxes and in interest on bonds, perhaps, to have prevented this spoilage of a fine resource; but this cost would have been a small percentage of the billions it will cost now to correct the mistakes we have made on this one river alone.

We can have a Potomac River you can swim in if you like, as clean as it is beautiful, but it will take time, money, and a great deal of desire and effort. Not one of us doubts that such an investment will have great value. Our regret should be that we are so late with our recognition of the symptoms and with our diagnosis and remedies.

But what is it that has made America's rivers unclean and unclear? We have long been aware of the garbage, the sewage and the industrial wastes which are going into our rivers. We have not, as a nation of resource stewards, been so conscious of another costly source of pollution. For example, did you know that 50 million tons of soil are eroded annually in the Potomac Basin and that 2½ million tons of sediment from the skinned-off real estate developments, the unprotected fields, the cuts and fills for roadways, the denuded construction sites and parking areas are discharged into the Potomac estuary each year. This sediment fouls the river, adding to the cost of making the water suitable for use, and damaging the aquatic life we would like it to sustain in abundance.

My purpose is to emphasize that the development of a plan for a river basin, with all its varied interests, its needs and its opportunities, is a vital, demanding thing. It can't be done in a week or two, nor can it be done alone by one group or another. It is a job that requires careful investigation, the collection and analysis of pertinent data, the patient study of possibilities, searching looks into the distant future, and the involvement of many people representing all the interests in the basin.

Planning may involve—as the Potomac in-

terim report indicates—the postponement of certain steps, just as it may urge the taking of another step much sooner than anyone had imagined. It may advise the building (as the Potomac report does) of certain small impoundments for supply purposes and the delay of a much larger one that had been thought to be urgently needed soon.

But the gathering of a group of interested citizens around a conference table for the purpose of determining the needs of their basin, the opportunities for the protection of its many values for the future and the development of others for the next few years—this is the way a basin must be planned, with all its values in mind and with all its citizens having a voice in the decisions that are to be made.

In recent years, we have seen a remarkable and fortunate change in our national attitude toward water resources. A generation ago, because of a spectacular kind of disaster that focused attention on what was happening to our soil resources, we launched a broad program of action for their protection. As an outgrowth of this new concern the states passed legislation providing local citizens the means of organizing to carry out their own programs of soil, water, plant and wildlife conservation. I would like to note here that Oklahoma and its neighboring state, Arkansas, were the first to pass state enabling legislation for this purpose.

But back to this new attitude of ours toward water resources. Drought during the past four years in the Northeast—an area where you normally don't hear much about drought—obviously has helped to stimulate American thinking along this line. Also, there has been developing a more sensitive national conscience, an awareness of what we had been doing, through neglect and abuse, to these vital resources.

In New York City the "well was running dry," and when the average citizen had to ask for a glass of water before he could get it, and the cafe owner was subject to a \$25 fine if he permitted his employees to serve water without a request, he began to realize how important this resource was to him as an individual. The city was alarmed and reaching out for a supply, when at the city's doorstep millions of gallons of water a day were flowing seaward, too filthy for any use by man or animal.

Our awakening, overdue as we may now regard it, has been marked by a series of recent and forthright actions designed to set our water resource house in order.

First, based on a recommendation of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, comprehensive framework studies are in process on five of our major water resource regions in America, and the 1967 budget provides for initiation of three more such studies—California, the Upper Colorado and the Lower Colorado. Detailed surveys also are under way in 16 other river basin areas.

So, we are on our way, although perhaps as yet we have not begun to catch up.

The Water Resources Research Act of 1964 provides for cooperation by the Secretary of the Interior with the Land Grant Colleges of the several states in establishing and carrying on water resources research institutes.

One aspect of the Appalachian Regional Development Act is a survey of the water and related resources of the area to learn the extent to which their development—with an investment of public funds—may contribute to the local economy. These studies will draw on and add to information available from other basin surveys in progress in portions of the area. Experience in these programs will have value, too, as we move into the Ozarks, Upper Great Lakes, and the New England Economic Development programs.

INFLATED PRICES

BAYH has released the results of two independent studies supporting his charges that steel purchased by Vietnam with American aid is of inferior quality and overpriced. He claims that Vietnam, using American aid, paid inflated prices for inferior steel manufactured in Japan and galvanized with insufficient zinc in Korea.

A study conducted by the General Accounting Office, at BAYH's request shows that prices for steel purchased by Vietnam "included certain improper costs ultimately paid for by the Agency of International Development." BAYH says the "improper costs" amounted to \$90 a ton.

The second study, conducted by the Societe De Surveillance, a Geneva-based organization, shows that Korean galvanizing mills use Japanese steel which "is processed chiefly from salvaged scrap." The study says the Koreans added to the steel sheets a "defectuous coating which is quickly weather-worn."

As a result of these findings, BAYH reports, AID has taken steps to assure quality control and deal with the problem of inflated prices. But BAYH is not satisfied.

BUY AMERICAN

He thinks steel purchased by Vietnam with foreign aid dollars should be manufactured by American companies. Good quality products would be assured without incurring the expense of imposing and policing quality control standards. American aid dollars would flow directly back to the U.S. in the form of taxes, wages and additional man-hours of work. No improper costs would creep into the prices paid for these products.

BAYH says AID is now considering a policy change. However, if the change does not incorporate his 90% American-made component plan, BAYH intends to seek "appropriate legislation."

The Senate earlier adopted BAYH's proposal as an amendment to a supplemental foreign aid bill. But House-Senate conferees removed the amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Putting it mildly, Mr. President, this article points out how right was the position taken by the able Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNTRUTHFUL ATTACKS ON
THE CIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, earlier today, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] made a statement dealing with attacks that are now currently being made upon the Central Intelligence Agency.

He stated:

A favorite "sport" now current among various groups which appears to be growing in volume is to attack the Central Intelligence Agency.

He further stated:

These charges are made by many people, including enemy aliens in defense of their activities, and those who have been charged with illegal activities. From the standpoint

of sport, at times it would appear comparable to shooting fish in a barrel, because the nature of the work of the CIA means it cannot defend itself.

Mr. President, I want to use this statement of the Senator from Missouri as a premise for what I shall now have to say.

I concur with him completely that because the CIA cannot defend itself and of necessity, by reason of its work, must remain silent, inducement has been provided by those who bear ill will toward certain individuals in the Agency to make attacks upon it.

The most recent attacks have dealt with the cases of James R. Christensen, with a Cuban exile, who was captured in Cuba and charged by Castro with having been hired by the Central Intelligence Agency to assassinate Castro, and in the third case, in relation to John R. Hawke. These attacks have been made with great bitterness. The Central Intelligence Agency has not been able to answer.

The claims that have been made against the agency are false.

I take the floor today to emphasize the fact that the interests of the United States are not being served by the attacks which are being made upon this Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator from Ohio be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The office of the Central Intelligence Agency is headed by Adm. W. F. Raborn. His assistant is Richard Helms. He has a legislative counsel and the staff of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The important aspect of the services rendered by this Agency, which are not being considered by those within our own ranks who are attacking the Agency, is the fact that the Agency works directly under the President. The Agency is subject to the supervision and direction of the National Security Council.

Who are the members of the National Security Council?

Lyndon B. Johnson, the President of the United States. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the Vice President. Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State. Robert S. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense. Buford Ellington, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. Then there is the Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, McGeorge Bundy, and Executive Secretary Bromley Smith.

Mr. President, I submit to all Senators that whatever attacks are being made upon that Agency are an implied attack upon the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chief of Emergency Planning.

For the past 20 years especially, it has been the objective of the Communists in the cold war to blacken the character of the Intelligence Agency of the United States. One of their principal techniques has been to lay at the doorstep of the Intelligence Agency the charges that

it is indulging in practices common and inherent to the Communists of the world.

With the Communists making the attacks, when support is given to those attacks by men on the Senate floor and by persons in our own Nation, it provides a great instrumentality for the Communists to publicize throughout the world that, within the Chambers of the U.S. Senate, these remarks have been made by officials of the U.S. Government, condemning the activity of this Agency.

It is with great hesitancy that I enter upon the discussion of the subject that I shall now undertake. One statement was made several months ago that the Central Intelligence Agency dressed its agents in the garb of Vietcong Communists and sent them among the innocent South Vietnamese to rape women and kill old men and children, and then to place the blame on the Vietcong.

That charge was denied most emphatically.

I want to repeat that charge—that the Agency, operating under the President, Vice President, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense, dressed its agents in the uniform of the Vietcong Communists and that they raped women and killed old men and children, solely to place the blame on the Vietcong.

When that statement was made, naturally Peking and Moscow picked it up and publicized it throughout all the world. Peking and Moscow quoted what was said, and stated:

United States official confirms the charges we have been making about the activities of the agents of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. President, I think the time has come to quit blackening the character of the United States and whitening that of the Communists, unless it can be established and proved that the charges we are making are true. Tragically, that is not the situation now.

The attacks are frequent. The attacks have been in some instances denied and labeled as false. But they still go on.

I cannot bring myself to believe for one moment that the members of the National Security Council would tolerate for one second the retention of Admiral Raborn and his assistants if there were one semblance of truth to the indictment that has been heaped upon them.

I have remained silent on this issue. I have said nothing about it. But I have seethed with agony and indignation in the knowledge of what has been going on.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I join fully and wholeheartedly in the statement made by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] this morning.

My hopes are that the people of the United States will understand what a well-organized technique has been adopted by the Communists to discredit

the Central Intelligence Agency and how unfortunate we are that additional strength has been given to that attack by the conduct and words of officials of the U.S. Government.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able senior Senator from Ohio for commenting on the remarks I made this morning.

The thrust of my statement was that before such charges are given such wide and continued publicity, a reasonable effort should be made to have them checked.

I was interested in what the distinguished Senator said about reactions of the foreign press to such charges made in this country.

I have recently read about 100 press stories, articles, and comments from the foreign press, free world and Iron Curtain countries, about recent articles concerning the structure and functioning of the CIA. The distortion of those articles in their presentation by the foreign press, in most cases out of context, furnishes a sad story for those to read who are interested in the security and prosperity of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes, by unanimous consent?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my discussion this morning will be about the irresponsibility of making statements. One which was quoted, relating to the charge that Central Intelligence agents raped women and killed innocent men and women, was later repudiated and recalled by the person who had made it. But the damage was done.

On my desk I have a copy of a press release out of Moscow, sent throughout the world, stating that the statement was made by a public official of the United States that the atrocities I have just described were being perpetrated by agents of the United States Central Intelligence Agency.

There is irresponsibility in the making of such statements. How damaging they can be, and how widely they are used by the Communists, is not fully comprehended. All the world knows that when a condemnation is made about this country, it is used by the Communists. Yet we continue to hear Americans repeating these charges announced and made against the Central Intelligence Agency.

MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to report that the Senate and House conferees have agreed to a conference report on S. 944, and have favorably reported the conference report.

Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagree-

ing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 944) to provide for expanded research and development in the marine environment of the United States, to establish a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and a Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 24, 1966, p. 10729.)

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

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this bill is commonly known as the broad oceanographic bill, in the field of marine science and resource development, which the Senator from New Hampshire and I, and some of the rest of us, have been working on for many, many months—as a matter of fact, for some three or four sessions of the Congress.

In the field of marine science and resource development the United States has been late but not, I believe, too late. Time is in the final analysis our most precious assets and time has not been on our side in the knowledge and use of the oceans. S. 944 is a major step in changing this. S. 944 as agreed upon by the Senate and House managers will lay the groundwork for a coordinated, cooperative, and comprehensive marine science and resource development program.

The bill does the following three things:

First. Sets a statutory base of policy and objectives to guide and promote oceanographic programs in the coming period of essential expansion;

Second. Establishes a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development to coordinate and encourage these programs until a longer-range governmental organization is effected; and

Third. Creates an Independent Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources to recommend appropriate programs and propose the Federal structure that will best implement such programs.

The major difference between the two bills that made the conference necessary was that the House measure did not provide for a Council. The managers for the House were concerned about the Council on two grounds: First, that it prejudged the structure that would finally be recommended by the Commission by appearing to be a congressionally preferred structure and second, based upon testimony before the House and Senate Committees by certain witnesses from the administration, the President might veto the bill. The first issue was clarified by limiting the Council to a life of 120 days after the submission of the final report by the Commission. This makes it clear that the purpose of the Council is a short-range one—that is, to

coordinate current marine activities until a final Federal framework is achieved, so that we will not lose time in this important field. In the event that a Federal reorganization in this activity is not effective by the expiration time of the Council, then the President may, by Executive order or requesting legislation, if he so wishes, extend its life until it is replaced by other mechanisms for developing and implementing marine science and resource programs.

The answer to the second matter of concern is that the President himself, when he was a Senator, very wisely laid the groundwork for our present space program in the National Aeronautics and Space Act which created in the Executive offices the National Aeronautics and Space Council. His wisdom then will be matched by similar wisdom as we meet our responsibilities in knowing and using that 70 percent of the earth's surface that is covered by water.

Before describing the bill in detail let me pay deep and sincere tribute to the House Members who worked on the measure, and particularly to their chairman, ALTON LENNON. Under his wise leadership they have mastered the field of marine science and resource development both in its essential principles as well as in its precise details. This country is fortunate indeed to have men of this caliber and commitment working in a field that is yet to develop the necessary overwhelming public concern and focus. The time will come when their foresight will be recognized widely; until then, they are continuing to promote this vital work.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT

The Senate bill establishes in the Executive Office of the President a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, composed of the Vice President as Chairman, the Secretaries of State, Navy, Interior, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Director of the National Science Foundation.

The Council will assist and advise the President in connection with a number of his enumerated responsibilities which include a survey of all significant marine science activities, development of a coordinated marine science program, and designation of responsibility for the conduct of such activities by Federal departments and agencies.

Included also in the program will be marine engineering, studies of air-sea interaction, transmission of energy and communications, and exploitation and conservation of the resources of the marine environment.

The Council would further assist the President in studies of legal problems arising out of the management, development, and use of marine resources, and in long-range studies of benefits to be gained from marine science and resources in the interest of the Nation's economy, security, health, and welfare.

The Council may employ a staff to be headed by a civilian executive secretary appointed by the President, and this staff may include professionals of whom not