

21646

tion for the public service rendered by the station which presented the program.

The program was one of a "Meet the Candidates" series on Lincoln, Nebr., television station KOLN and Grand Island, Nebr., station KGIN-TV. It was my privilege to be interviewed on this program by a panel of four impartial newsmen. The purpose was to obtain my views on a number of subjects pertinent in the campaign for U.S. Senator in Nebraska.

My opponent was also interviewed for the same amount of time, 30 minutes, by the same panel of newsmen.

The programs were video-taped and were presented over television a week or so later at times which were announced in advance.

The television station did not present these programs during hours when viewership is low or when television time is relatively cheap. Rather, the station canceled regularly scheduled programs at prime times and in the process incurred a loss in revenue in order to present these programs.

Besides the race for Senator, the station video-taped similar interview programs for the offices of Governor and Lieutenant Governor and for the House of Representatives.

I believe, Mr. President, that this was a public service of the highest, in keeping with the finest traditions of responsibility by the public information media in a free society to present the views of candidates in an election.

There was no haranguing debate of the type that adds nothing but confusion to a campaign. The questions were direct and the candidates had to respond, or else they would very clearly appear to be dodging. The questions were asked and answered in a factual, unemotional atmosphere. Of course, the candidates could respond in an excited fashion if they so desired, or they could ramble, or be concise. They could "put on a show" if they wished, but the participants were there to ask and answer questions in the true spirit of a factual, unemotional discussion of the problems facing this Nation today.

It was my pleasure to appear on this program with this fine panel of newsmen on KOLN-KGIN-TV. I am sure that the programs added light rather than heat to the campaign in Nebraska. I feel that the Nation will be a better place to live when all elections are held more on the basis of facts rather than of fancy and emotion. I believe these programs as presented by the Lincoln-Grand Island stations represent the free-enterprise broadcasting and television industry at its best in America.

#### PROFOUND HARMONY BETWEEN ADMINISTRATION AND WASHINGTON POST

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on August 25 I placed in the RECORD two editorials published by the Washington Post. One of the editorials took umbrage at what was construed as a suggestion I had made that the Post seemed overly eager to please the administration.

In order to complete the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a second Post editorial, dated September 13, reminding us that the appointment of the Post's former executive vice president to the ambassadorial post in Switzerland is one of the best non-career appointments ever made by our Government. It is gratifying and reassuring to observe the profound harmony which exists between the administration and the Washington Post.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 13, 1966]

#### NEW AMBASSADOR

The Johnson Administration, notable in its search for talent within the ranks of the government establishment, has also tried hard to find qualified people in private life. The diplomatic appointment of John S. Hayes, president of the Washington Post-Newsweek radio and television stations in Jacksonville and in Washington, is one such recruit produced by the diligent talent searches under the direction of Civil Service Commissioner John W. Macy Jr. Ambassador Hayes who now goes to the important post in Switzerland ought to be well qualified for an assignment that has become of increasing interest to this country.

His new post will involve on his part a personal financial sacrifice and on the part of the Washington Post Company a loss of executive talent. But this sort of climax to a private career is in the best tradition of our earlier non-career diplomatic servants. Men of broad experience in private business have talents useful to government, and public service gratifies a healthy impulse for the distinction of serving the country.

Ambassador Hayes has been a leader in his own profession and industry and he has served his community well in such non-governmental posts as President of the United Community Funds and Councils of America. The friends he has won among his colleagues in broadcasting and publishing fields and among those associated with him in civic enterprises will wish him success in his new public role.

#### U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Tom Wicker, a writer for the New York Times, has written a perceptive article which was published in the New York Times on September 2.

The article underscores the logical and substantive contradictions of some recent pronouncements by the administration concerning our aims and presence in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wicker's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Sept. 2, 1966]

#### CALLING A SPADE AN EARTHMOVER

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, September 1.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk recently spoke to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. On the same day he conferred with U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations. Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, a dedicated Rusk-watcher, then rose in the Senate to discuss

the New York Times's account of Mr. Rusk's statements.

"In the conversation with Mr. U Thant," the Senator said, "according to the Times, the Secretary asserted that the United States wanted to de-escalate the Vietnam war" but said there was lack of interest on the part of Hanoi and its allies.

#### PULLOUT WOULD BE FATAL

"Speaking to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, however, the Secretary of State said that a premature pullout from Vietnam would surely lead to World War III. According to the paper, Mr. Rusk said: 'Any withdrawal before complete victory over Communist aggression would be . . . fatal.'"

Senator FULBRIGHT concluded: "So one can take a choice of U.S. policy—de-escalation or complete victory. Except that I had always presumed that these were mutually exclusive."

While still in this state of bemusement, Senator FULBRIGHT might direct his attention to President Johnson's recent address to the American Legion. Mr. Johnson described the Vietnamese war this way:

"It is meant to be the opening salvo in a series of bombardments or, as they are called in Peking, 'wars of liberation.' And if it succeeds in South Vietnam, then, as Marshal Lin Piao says, and I quote him, 'The people in other parts of the world will see that what the Vietnamese people can do they can do, too.'"

But a page or two later, the President said of the people of Asia, including the South Vietnamese: "Our assistance to these nations, our involvement in their affairs, will be no greater than they choose to have it."

Again one may have a choice—but how is the idea of a vital world struggle to stop Chinese expansion and aggression to be reconciled with the statement that the effort to aid Asian nations will be "no greater than they choose to have it"? For if American vital interests and security really are threatened by Chinese-backed wars of liberation, in Vietnam or elsewhere, these would have to be met with the force required whether or not the nations providing the immediate battlefield "choose to have it."

#### THREATENED CHAOS

But Mr. Johnson was not through. So interwoven was the American destiny with that of all nations, he said, "that our responsibilities would be just as real in the absence of the Communist threat." That is, the needs and aspirations of the "underdeveloped peoples" have to be met or "the ranging search and quest for bread may bring on the reality of chaos."

It may well be argued that these are linked objectives—that the defense of one small country is the pivot on which resistance to Chinese expansionism turns, and that unless that resistance succeeds, the underdeveloped peoples will be subverted by Peking rather than elevated by Washington.

If so, the inescapable logic of the argument is that the bedrock American war aim in Vietnam is to confront Communist Chinese expansionism as a matter of vital interest to the United States and world tranquility. This might be a compelling argument—except that there are no Chinese fighting in Vietnam, the Administration insists there is no evidence that any Chinese will fight in Vietnam, and no one has been able to show that Peking controls what the Administration calls the North Vietnamese "aggressors."

#### THE CHINESE MENACE

In fact, some here believe that, since Ho Chi Minh makes such an improbable Hitler and has demonstrated so many times that he is no puppet, the Chinese world menace has had to be put forward by the Administration to justify its major war effort in Southeast Asia.

Whereas the security of the United States and its citizens remains interwoven with the security of other nations signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty as it was when the treaty was signed, but the condition of our European allies, both economically and militarily, has appreciably improved since large contingents of forces were deployed; and

Whereas the means and capacity of all members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to provide forces to resist aggression has significantly improved since the original United States deployment; and

Whereas the commitment by all members of the North Atlantic Treaty is based upon the full cooperation of all treaty partners in contributing materials and men on a fair and equitable basis, but such contributions have not been forthcoming from all other members of the organization; and

Whereas relations between Eastern Europe and Western Europe were tense when the large contingents of United States forces were deployed in Europe but this situation has now undergone substantial change and relations between the two parts of Europe are now characterized by an increasing two-way flow of trade, people and other peaceful exchange; and

Whereas the present policy of maintaining large contingents of United States forces and their dependents on the European continent also contribute further to the fiscal and monetary problems of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) It is the sense of the Senate that, with changes and improvements in the techniques of modern warfare and because of the vast increase in capacity of the United States to wage war and to move military forces and equipment by air, a substantial reduction of United States forces permanently stationed in Europe can be made without adversely affecting either our resolve or ability to meet our commitment under the North Atlantic Treaty;

(2) S. Res. 99, adopted in the Senate April 4, 1951, is amended to contain the provisions of this resolution and, where the resolutions may conflict, the present resolution is controlling as to the sense of the Senate.

#### FULL LIST OF COSPONSORS TO S. 300

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. HART, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia) submitted the following resolution; which was held without reference.

#### GNASHING OF TEETH

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recent Supreme Court decisions interpreting the rights of the individual in criminal cases have created considerable controversy throughout the United States. In the September 1966, issue of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Law Enforcement Bulletin, the FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover points out that:

There is little to be gained from just shouting protests and criticisms, but there is much to be gained from throwing our full resources and energies into training a professional law enforcement corps to be effective within the framework of current rules of law and evidence.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the Director's

message from the Law Enforcement Bulletin and an editorial on this message which appeared in the Sunday, September 4, 1966, issue of the Washington Post.

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

[From the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

There has been much "wailing and gnashing of teeth" in some law enforcement circles lately in response to developments in the criminal law, particularly confessions, interrogations, search and seizure, and various rights of the accused.

Historically, American courts have assumed the responsibility of assuring that governmental power is not misused to injure the rights of individual citizens. Our courts are now committed to exercising supervisory control over law enforcement through the exclusionary theory whereby evidence obtained in violation of certain rules cannot be used in a criminal trial.

Various courts have been roundly criticized for recent decisions which some reviewers say reflect an unjustified and unprecedented concern for the lawbreaker; for illogical, shortsighted judicial policies which in effect legislate new laws to the detriment of society. They have been charged with handcuffing law enforcement by requiring impossible procedures which, it is said, will insure the release of the guilty while destroying the morale of the officer.

In reply, some critics of police declare that unless we have tight, restrictive control of law enforcement, police lawlessness will result. The extremes of both views tend to cloud the fact that the police and the courts should have a common objective: to develop and maintain a system of administering criminal justice which is fair, impartial, and effective. All will agree that this is an exceedingly difficult and complex task.

There is little to be gained from just shouting protests and criticisms, but there is much to be gained from throwing our full resources and energies into training a professional law enforcement corps to be effective within the framework of current rules of law and evidence.

We, as citizens, expect the business and technical segments of our society to keep abreast of the latest developments in their respective areas and to conduct research to foster progress. Our profession, dedicated to the preservation of America's basic freedoms, certainly cannot exempt itself from a similar demand from other citizens. A continuing, comprehensive research and training program, with a conscientious application of the knowledge gained therefrom, is the key to properly discharging our responsibilities to the people and the Nation.

Increased professional police training is no longer a desirable goal, no longer a matter of choice for United States law enforcement. It is an absolute necessity.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, Director,

SEPTEMBER 1, 1966.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 4, 1966]

#### "GNASHING OF TEETH"

There has been much "wailing and gnashing of teeth" in some law enforcement circles lately in response to developments in the criminal law, particularly confessions, interrogations, search and seizure, and various rights of the accused. Historically, American courts have assumed the responsibility of assuring that governmental power is not misused to injure the rights of individual citizens. . . . There is little to be gained from just shouting protests and criticisms, but there is much to be gained from throwing out our full resources and energies into

training a professional law enforcement corps to be effective within the framework of current rules of law and evidence.

Who said that? Some bleeding heart? Some professional do-gooder? Some sentimental coddler of criminals? Not exactly. The words were written by J. Edgar Hoover in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. They make an invaluable contribution to effective law enforcement, in our opinion. They put in perspective the prophecies of doom that have come from some less thoughtful police officers and prosecutors. They remind Americans that the restraints which the Supreme Court has placed upon investigation and prosecution of crime are among the fundamental political rights of free men; they are the indispensable means of forestalling arbitrary and tyrannical governmental power.

Law enforcement has not been shackled. Criminals have not been given *carte blanche*. Resourceful and resolute policemen are going steadily about their business of investigating crime and bringing criminals to justice—and by methods that commend themselves to a free and self-governing people. Mr. Hoover deserves thanks for helping to make that plain.

#### SCHOOL MILK ASSISTANCE ESSENTIAL AS MORE AND MORE DAIRY FARMERS LEAVE FARM

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, recent figures for August milk production indicate that the continuing exodus of dairy farmers into other, better paying, operations still continues. August production was lower than it has been in any August since 1939 when our population was two-thirds of what it is now. It was 2 percent below August of 1965 and 4 percent below the 1960-64 average. Furthermore, milk production for the first 8 months of 1966 has been 4 percent below a comparable period in 1965.

There is no doubt in my mind that unless we insure a decent income for the dairy farmer, milk production is going to dip ever lower. As a result there will ultimately be a very, very sharp price increase as the demand for milk begins to outstrip the supply.

One of the steps we can take to improve dairy income and thus keep the dairy farmer on the farm is to support and expand the school milk program. The program aids farmers by creating a greater demand for milk which results in a better price to the farmer. The program received \$104 million for fiscal 1967 in the agriculture appropriations bill. However, an additional \$6 million is needed if the milk program is to reimburse program participants at a level equivalent to that existing in past years.

I intend to fight for an increase in school milk funds in a supplemental appropriations bill for the benefit of both the dairy farmer and the consumer who will suffer greatly if milk production continues to decline.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE POLITICAL CAMPAIGN PROGRAMS BY TELEVISION STATIONS IN NEBRASKA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to describe a television program on which I appeared recently in Nebraska, and to express my apprecia-

Whatever the case, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Rusk might clear away some public confusion if they clarified their own rhetoric about confronting China, aiding small nations, healing the sick, enforcing the SEATO pact, and keeping President Eisenhower's commitments.

#### CONSIDER THE GAINS WE HAVE MADE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, differences, difficulties, and disturbances always get the headlines. Nor did any great reform or reevaluation come easily. The riots of Watts, Dayton, Cicero, Cleveland, Chicago, or Atlanta are emblazoned on the front pages of our newspapers and are recorded on radio and television screen. They include such nauseating and infamous occurrences as that reported from Grenada, Miss., on the front page of the Washington Post yesterday.

The story was datelined Grenada, Miss., September 12. It began:

A mob of angry whites wielding ax handles, pipes and chains surrounded two schools that were integrated today and attacked Negroes trying to leave when classes were over.

At least 33 persons were beaten at the school, Negro leaders said, including a 12-year-old boy whose leg was broken.

City policemen did little to stop the attack, and state troopers had to be called in to rescue the Negroes.

One Negro youth ran a gauntlet of cursing whites for a full block, his face bleeding, his clothes torn.

I need not read further because Federal officials take the law of the land seriously and news stories today tell of the suit filed Tuesday in Federal Court in Oxford, Miss., in which the Justice Department charged that local public officials including the sheriff and chief of police, stood by while a crowd of whites beat Negro school children. What a loathsome spectacle. The Department of Justice now asks that the officials be required to protect Negro children from the whites who are opposing school integration in Grenada.

Yet, while these disgraceful and deplorable blots on our American escutcheon occur to the shame of those who perpetuate them and the officials who tolerate them, it is well to take note of the tremendous gains our Nation has made to bring to each citizen the full privileges of American citizenship. Much remains to be corrected, but truly the gains of the last 12 years are astounding.

The Supreme Court decision in the Brown case of 1954, opened a new era. Prior to that time it was impossible to take a Negro friend to lunch in any Washington, D.C. hotel. One could do so only at the Union Station. Well-known and distinguished public servants such as Ralph Bunche or Thurgood Marshall or Robert Weaver had to endure such discrimination and humiliation and only all because of the color of their skin. But that much has been corrected. It belongs to the bitter past.

Increasingly, our colored citizens have achieved high public office. They will achieve more, and one day soon, we may

hope we will not make a reference to color, but, rather, only to the name and the qualifications of the individual concerned. Here are but a few of the men and women whose abilities have been recognized at the Federal Government level:

Robert Weaver is the first Negro American to be named a member of a President's cabinet. He deserves this honor. He achieved it on merit. His was a fitting recognition of devoted public service, experience and expertness in the field of housing.

Thurgood Marshall is the first Negro to be Solicitor General for the Department of Justice.

The New York Times of September 10 contained an account by Mr. Paul Hofmann of the induction of Mrs. Constance Baker Motley as the first Negro woman in the country's history to hold a Federal Judgeship and the first woman member of the Federal Court for the Southern District of New York. It is interesting to learn from Mr. Hofmann's story that Solicitor General Thurgood Marshall once worked with Mrs. Motley in the NAACP.

Andrew F. Brimmer, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, is now a member of the Federal Reserve Board.

Hobart Taylor, previously Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment, is now a Director of the Export-Import Bank.

Lyle Carter, was recently appointed Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Roger W. Wilkins is the Director, Community Relations Service, Department of Commerce.

Mrs. Patricia Harris is the Ambassador to Luxembourg.

Elliot P. Skinner is the Ambassador to Upper Volta.

Dr. James Nabrit is the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Sam Nabrit is a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Wade H. McCree was just appointed to the Sixth District Court of Appeals.

Integration is proceeding in this Nation—let no one overlook this gratifying development. As a nation we had and still have our problems in this tremendous field. The important fact is that the United States is an open society whose passing afflictions stand out clearly and, occasionally, grotesquely.

Integration is proceeding because men like Dr. Martin Luther King and Roy Wilkins and Clarence M. Mitchell here in Washington combine action with reason.

Integration is proceeding because national organizations like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People continue to work with all citizens, not just one color or one political group. The NAACP has been bloodied on occasion, but it has not been beaten and as Americans we should be very proud of this association. Let the militant radical shout "Uncle Tom," but let him remember as he does that those at whom he shouts were in the forefront in this fight long before him.

Colored Americans have been incredibly patient. They have been patient for

a century. For this we may be thankful and for this we must give a measure of credit to a system of government, which while imperfect, is still the best man has. Our colored slums had a few escape hatches. Gradually, perhaps principally through the doors of the world of music and on the playing fields of the world of sports, where a man or woman is judged for his talent and skills, it became clear that the color of one's skin was unimportant. Today I can think of no more superb example of talent being recognized and properly honored than that which occurs this week as the Metropolitan Opera's Leontyne Price opens the new opera house in Lincoln Center in New York City. Miss Price, a Negro, sings the leading role in "Anthony and Cleopatra," a musical part written for her by Mr. Samuel Barber. Yes, we have made substantial progress.

In Alaska we are proud of the progressive legislation which the State has enacted in the field of human rights. Section 18.80.240 includes not only open housing accommodations but unimproved property or as it was known at the time the "open land provision". Our State act relating to the Commission on Human Rights also includes section 18.80.250 which places financial institutions under the act and specifically prohibits discrimination against persons seeking financial assistance because of race, religion, color or national origin.

Both of these farsighted, humanitarian provisions are, I believe, the products of the Alaska State House of Representatives House Judiciary Committee of which State Representative Gene Guess is chairman.

I ask unanimous consent the chapter 117 of the Laws of Alaska, 1965, relating to the Commission for Human Rights be made a part of the Record so that my colleagues and others will know how the Alaska State Legislature has expressed itself affirmatively in regards to civil rights.

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

(C.S.H.B. 139)

LAWS OF ALASKA, 1965—CHAPTER 117

(An act relating to the Commission for Human Rights; and providing for an effective date.)

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Section 1. AS 18.80.060 is repealed and re-enacted to read:

"Sec. 18.80.060. Powers and Duties of the Commission. (a) In addition to the other powers and duties prescribed by this chapter the commission shall

"(1) appoint an executive director approved by the governor;

"(2) hire other administrative staff as may be necessary to the commission's function;

"(3) exercise general supervision and direct the activities of the executive director and other administrative staff;

"(4) accept complaints under sec. 100 of this chapter;

"(5) study the problems of discrimination in all or specific fields of human relationships, and foster through community effort or goodwill, cooperation and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population of the state, and publish results

of investigations and research as in its judgment will tend to eliminate discrimination because of race, religion, color, or national ancestry.

"(b) In addition to the other powers and duties prescribed by this chapter the commission may

"(1) delegate to the executive director all powers and duties given it by this chapter except the duties and powers given it by secs. 120 and 130 of this chapter;

"(2) call upon the departments and agencies of the state, with the approval of the governor, for cooperation and assistance in carrying out this chapter;

"(3) hold hearings under sec. 120 of this chapter, subpoena witnesses, take the testimony of any person under oath, administer oaths, and in connection therewith, to require the production for examination of books or papers relating to a matter under investigation or in question before the commission.'

"Sec. 2. AS 18.80.100 is amended to read:

"Sec. 18.80.100 Complaint. A person who believes he is aggrieved by any discriminatory conduct prohibited by this chapter may sign and file with the commission a written, verified complaint stating the name and address of the person alleged to have engaged in discriminatory conduct and the particulars of the discrimination. The executive director may file a complaint in like manner when an alleged discrimination comes to his attention.'

"Sec. 3. AS 18.80.120 is amended to read:

"Sec. 18.80.120 Hearing. If the informal efforts to eliminate the alleged discrimination are unsuccessful, the executive director shall inform the commission of the failure, and the commission shall serve written notice together with a copy of the complaint, requiring the person, employer, labor organization or employment agency, charged in the complaint to answer the allegations of the complaint at a hearing before the commission. The hearing shall be held by the commission at the place where the unlawful conduct is alleged to have occurred unless the person, employer, labor organization or employment agency requests a change of venue for good cause shown. The case in support of the complaint shall be presented before the commission by the executive director or his designee who shall be a bona fide resident of the state. The executive director may request the assistance of the Department of Law in the preparation and presentation of any complaint before the commission. The person charged in the complaint may file a written answer to the complaint and may appear at the hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, and submit testimony. The executive director has the power reasonably and fairly to amend the complaint, and the person charged has the power reasonably and fairly to amend his answer. The commission shall not be bound by the strict rules of evidence prevailing in courts of law or equity. The testimony taken at the hearing shall be under oath and be transcribed.'

"Sec. 4. AS 18.80.130 is amended to read:

"Sec. 18.80.130. Order. (a) At the completion of the hearing, if the commission finds that a person against whom a complaint was filed has engaged in the discriminatory conduct alleged in the complaint, it shall order him to refrain from engaging in the discriminatory conduct. The order shall include findings of fact, and may prescribe conditions on the accused's future conduct relevant to the type of discrimination. In a case involving discrimination in

"(1) employment, the commission may order the hiring, reinstatement or upgrading of an employee with or without back pay, restoration to membership in a labor organization, or his admission to or participation in an apprenticeship training program, on-

the-job training program or other retraining program;

"(2) housing, the commission may order the sale, lease or rental of the housing accommodation to the aggrieved person if it is still available, or the sale, lease or rental of a like accommodation owned by the person against whom the complaint was filed if one is still available, or the sale, lease or rental of the next vacancy in a like accommodation, owned by the person against whom the complaint was filed.

"(b) The order may require a report on the manner of compliance.

"(c) If the commission finds that a person against whom a complaint was filed has not engaged in the discriminatory conduct alleged in the complaint, it shall issue and cause to be served on the complainant an order dismissing the complaint.

"(d) A copy of the order shall be filed in all cases with the attorney general of Alaska.'

"Sec. 5. AS 18.80 is amended by adding a new section to read:

"Sec. 18.80.135. Judicial Review and Enforcement. (a) A complainant, or person against whom a complaint is filed or other person aggrieved by an order of the commission, may obtain judicial review of the order in accordance with AS 44.62.560-44.62.570.

"(b) The commission may obtain a court order for the enforcement of any of its orders by filing a complaint with the superior court in the judicial district in which the unlawful conduct is alleged to have occurred.'

"Sec. 6. AS 18.80 is amended by adding a new section to read:

"ARTICLE 4. DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES PROHIBITED.

"Sec. 18.80.200 Purpose. (a) It is determined and declared as a matter of legislative finding that discrimination against an inhabitant, of the state because of race, religion, color, national origin, age or sex is a matter of public concern and that such discrimination not only threatens the rights and privileges of the inhabitants of the state but also menaces the institutions of the state and threatens peace, order, health, safety and general welfare of the state and its inhabitants.

"(b) Therefore, it is the policy of the state and the purpose of this chapter to eliminate and prevent discrimination in employment, in places of public accommodation, in housing accommodations and in the sale or lease of unimproved property because of race, religion, color, national origin, or in the case of employment, because of sex or age.

"Sec. 18.80.210 Civil Rights. The opportunity to obtain employment, public accommodations, housing accommodations and property without discrimination because of race, religion, color, or national origin is a civil right.

"Sec. 18.80.220. Unlawful Employment Practices. It is unlawful for

"(1) an employer to refuse employment to a person, or to bar him from employment, or to discriminate against him in compensation or in a term, condition, or privilege of employment because of his race, religion, color or national origin, or because of his age when the reasonable demands of the position do not require age distinction;

"(2) a labor organization, because of a person's age, race, religion, color or national origin, to exclude or to expel him from its membership, or to discriminate in any way against one of its members or an employer or an employee;

"(3) an employer or employment agency to print or circulate or cause to be printed or circulated a statement, advertisement, or publication, or to use a form of application for employment or to make an inquiry in connection with prospective employment, which expresses, directly or indirectly, a

limitation, specification or discrimination as to age, race, creed, color or national origin, or an intent to make the limitation, unless based upon a bona fide occupational qualification;

"(4) an employer, labor organization or employment agency to discharge, expel or otherwise discriminate against a person because he has opposed any practices forbidden under secs. 200-280 of this chapter or because he has filed a complaint, testified or assisted in a proceeding under this chapter; or

"(5) an employer to discriminate in the payment of wages as between the sexes, or to employ a female in an occupation in this state at a salary or wage rate less than that paid to a male employee for work of comparable character or work in the same operation, business or type of work in the same locality.

"Sec. 18.80.230 Unlawful Practices in Places of Public Accommodation. It is unlawful for the owner, lessee, manager, agent or employee of a public accommodation

"(1) to refuse, withhold from or deny to a person any of its services, goods, facilities, advantages or privileges because of race, religion, color or national origin;

"(2) to publish, circulate, issue, display, post or mail a written or printed communication, notice or advertisement which states or implies that any of the services, goods, facilities, advantages or privileges of the public accommodation will be refused, withheld from or denied to a person of a certain race, religion, color or national origin or that the patronage of a person belonging to a particular race, creed, color or national origin is unwelcome, not desired or solicited.

"Sec. 18.80.240 Unlawful Practices in the Sale or Rental of Property or Housing Accommodations. It is unlawful for the owner, lessee, manager or other person having the right to sell, lease or rent a housing accommodation or unimproved property

"(1) to refuse to sell, lease or rent the housing accommodation or unimproved property to a person because of race, religion, color or national origin;

"(2) to discriminate against a person because of race, religion, color or national origin in a term, condition or privilege relating to the use, sale, lease or rental of a housing accommodation or unimproved property; or

"(3) to make a written or oral inquiry or record of the race, religion, color or national origin of a person seeking to buy, lease or rent a housing accommodation or unimproved property.

"Sec. 18.80.250. Unlawful Financing Practice. It is unlawful for a financial institution, upon receiving an application for financial assistance for the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, repair or maintenance of a housing accommodation or the acquisition or improvement of unimproved property, to permit one of its officials or employees during the execution of his duties.

"(1) to discriminate against the applicant because of race, religion, color or national origin in a term, condition or privilege relating to the obtaining or use of the institution's financial assistance; or

"(2) to make or cause to be made a written or oral inquiry or record of the race, religion, color or national origin of a person seeking the institution's financial assistance.

"Sec. 18.80.260. Coercion. It is unlawful for a person to aid, abet, incite, compel or coerce the doing of an act forbidden under this chapter or to attempt to do so.

"Sec. 18.80.270. Penalty. A person, employer, labor organization or employment agency, who or which willfully engages in an unlawful discriminatory conduct prohibited by this chapter, or willfully resists, prevents, impedes or interferes with the commission or any of its authorized representatives in

21752

o'clock tomorrow. We will leave here at approximately 12:15 o'clock and proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of meeting in joint meeting with the House of Representatives to hear the very distinguished President of the Philippines, Ferdinand Marcos, deliver an address to a joint session.

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—  
ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED**

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 11488. An act to authorize the grade of brigadier general in the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13508. An act to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program.

**A VIETNAM VIEW**

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter to the editor which was published in the Longmont Times Call, written by Charles L. Dunfee, Sr., who is now in Vietnam.

I commend his thoughts and his inspiration to all Senators, and I truly believe that they will find inspiration in his words.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Is there objection?

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

**VIETNAM VIEW**

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Specialist Charles L. Dunfee, Jr., is the son of Mr. and Mrs. F. H. Dunfee of 436 Baker St., Longmont. He is a graduate of Longmont High School and has been in the Army 12 years. His wife Amy, formerly of Mead, and his three children are living in Longmont now. Charles Jr. started kindergarten Tuesday morning.)

To the Editor:

"Get out of Viet Nam!" I heard as I suddenly woke, wide awake. It was two o'clock in the morning, Saigon time, when I woke up with these words ringing loudly in my ears. I rolled over in the sack and tried to go back to sleep, but this thought kept running through my mind, and sleep just wasn't there. Yes, let's get out of Viet Nam! Then what? The fighting was just four miles away last night, the flares and tracers were readily visible as the sounds of battle rang clear in the night. It is now the dead quiet hours of early morning with the sounds of fighting not two hours silent, and here I lie thinking of this question, "Then What?"

"After we back out of Viet Nam, I hear vividly that little voice in the back of my mind saying, "Get out of the Philippines!"

Oh, well, they are a small chain of islands, not worth fighting for. Let's not have any trouble over them. Next I hear, "Get out of Japan and Korea!" We were there before fighting, let's not go through that again, instead let's move out of there, too. What comes next? Oh, yes, "Get out of Hawaii!" Now wait a minute!!! That is one of our own states. But then again let's think this over. Hawaii is such a small place, and so far away from our mainland. Is it really worth fighting for? Then that little voice gets an even more menacing tone to it. "Get out of San Francisco!" Now we have come to the end of our backing; but now let's stop to survey the situation more clearly. Now it is America against the whole world; do you know, we look mighty small in that light.

As the hours drag by I look back now. Why am I in Viet Nam? Myself, like so many others, we asked to be here. I think I have the most beautiful, wonderful country in the world, and I want to keep it that way. I have seen the devastation in Korea, and now history is repeating itself here in Viet Nam. Let's not see the ravages of war in our own country. I really wonder, do these people at home ever think beyond the end of their noses when they cry, "Let's bring our boys home?"

The soldier has a Code by which he lives. It starts, "I am an American fighting man. I serve the forces which guard my country and our way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense." It ends, "I will never forget that I am an American fighting man, responsible for my actions, and dedicated to the principles which made my country free. I will trust in my God and in the United States of America." These aren't just some words on a piece of paper. To most of us over here, it is an utterance from our very hearts. If I must fight and possibly die for my country, I do so with the knowledge that it is God's will, and I do so of my own free will. I just wish I could tell the whole world of this feeling that is within me. I dedicate my life to my wife and our three children—that if necessary I will gladly give it up with the thought of the words of our Lord when he said, "What greater love is there than if a man lay down his life for a friend." I am speaking for many men when I say that my family will live in freedom and safety because we are stopping the forces of evil over here, before it has the chance to spread to our very homes.

The dawn is beginning to break; I guess I had better get off this cloud and back to the reality that this is a hot, miserable country, and we have a bloody, stinking war that we MUST fight.

Sp5c. CHARLES L. DUNFEE, Sr.  
U.S. Army.

**INTERNAL REVENUE'S NEW PROPOSED REGULATIONS ON DEDUCTIBILITY OF EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES**

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on July 7, 1966, the Internal Revenue Service issued notice of its intention to change the tax regulations with regard to the deductibility of educational expenses. These changes would, in essence, disallow many of the members of the teaching profession from deducting costs which they incur in bettering their abilities and skills for educating our young.

Continually, since the issuance of T.D. 6291 by the IRS in 1958, this agency has forced large numbers of teachers into litigation over their eligibility to deduct certain of their expenditures made in

obtaining new teaching knowledge. This policy was followed despite the fact that it has been a longstanding intent of Congress that expenses incurred by teachers for their education could be deducted even in cases where they were incurred voluntarily and taken for academic credit or a degree, or in expectation of an increase in salary. The position taken by the IRS was that expenses could be deducted only when the teacher had met the "minimum" qualifications for his employment, thereby in pursuing additional education it would only be to "maintain or improve" existing skills. In each of these cases, the IRS lost because the distinctions which they advanced were not in line with the recognized congressional policy.

Now the IRS has decided that what they cannot accomplish by judicial decisions can be accomplished by the issuance of new regulations. Therefore, the judicially sanctioned tests of "maintaining or improving skills" and "pursuing the requirements of employment, regardless of academic credit" have been discarded presumably because these tests rendered it too difficult to win a tax case. In its new proposed regulations, the IRS has not only reinstated the so-called minimum test which had been refuted by many judicial decisions, but had defined the test in a way which, practically speaking, ends all reasonable chance of deducting educational expenses.

The proposed regulations state that educational expenses "are not deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses even though they may maintain or improve skills required by the individual in his present employment" if the additional training, first, qualifies "the individual for a position which he has not, at the time such education is undertaken, met the minimum education requirements"; or second, results in a "substantial advancement" of position or salary; or third, "is undertaken as a part of a program leading to attainment of a recognized level of education" such as a "degree, diploma, or similar certificate evidencing completion of a recognized education program."

Mr. President, we are in a period of history when the fourth grade child is being exposed to more technical science projects than we in our generation even dreamed, when first graders are becoming multilingual, and when sixth grade students understand complicated algebra and geometry problems, yet the IRS has proposed criteria for the deduction of teachers' expenses which are not only illogical, but completely foreign to our American concept of education. We expect our teachers to advance new ideas, but in these proposed regulations we undercut the principal initiative which motivates teachers to maintain the necessary high quality to teach these subjects. The examples offered in the regulations, section (f), illustrate this. If a teacher does not have a permanent or continuing teaching certificate he is not considered as having met his "minimum employment requirement" so that regardless of his desire to increase his knowledge, any expenses for courses which he takes are considered to be "personal expenses" to



September 14, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21751

tion in assuring orderly and efficient action today. It is the hope of the leadership that cooperation of this magnitude will continue on for the remainder of the session.

**CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966**

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

**CLOTURE MOTION**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call for the quorum under the rule be suspended on the next vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 14765 shall be brought to a close? Under the rule, the yeas and nays are required.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] are paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 42, as follows:

[Leg. No. 254]

**YEAS—54**

Aiken	Harris	Morse
Allott	Hart	Moss
Anderson	Hartke	Muskie
Bass	Inouye	Nelson
Bayh	Jackson	Neuberger
Boggs	Javits	Pastore
Brewster	Kennedy, Mass.	Pell
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Case	Kuchel	Randolph
Church	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Clark	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Dodd	McCarthy	Scott
Dominick	McGovern	Smith
Douglas	McIntyre	Symington
Fong	Metcalf	Tydings
Gore	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Griffin	Monroney	Yarborough
Gruening	Montoya	Young, Ohio

**NAYS—42**

Bennett	Carlson	Eastland
Bible	Cooper	Ellender
Byrd, Va.	Cotton	Ervin
Byrd, W. Va.	Curtis	Fannin
Cannon	Dirksen	Fulbright

Hickenlooper	Miller	Simpson
Hill	Morton	Smathers
Holland	Mundt	Sparkman
Hruska	Murphy	Stennis
Jordan, N.C.	Pearson	Talmadge
Jordan, Idaho	Prouty	Thurmond
Lausche	Robertson	Tower
Long, La.	Russell, S.C.	Williams, Del.
McClellan	Russell, Ga.	Young, N. Dak.

**NOT VOTING—4**

Bartlett	Magnuson	McGee
Hayden		

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote there are 54 yeas and 42 nays. Under rule XXII, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask the Vice President to restore order in the Senate before any further proceedings take place so that Senators can hear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator is desirable and in order. Senators will please be seated.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

**ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW, FRIDAY, AND MONDAY—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for tomorrow, and possibly the next day, and in so far as he knows, into Monday of next week, and also the hour for the convening of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the questions raised by my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, I would like at this time to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Friday it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the business will be what we have been having for the past 6 or 7 days, I may say to my distinguished colleague: the question of taking up a little bill which the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has been trying for a week to bring to the attention of the Senate.

In the meantime, with the minority leader's permission, and the Senate's concurrence, we will take up unobjected-to items and keep the calendar as clear as we can.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I could not hear the last statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall try to keep the calendar clear. There are some

bills on the calendar which have been reported by the Committee on Armed Services. There will be a couple of bills having to do with the Philippines, and one having to do with interest rates, and that will likely be brought up tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have one other question, and I hope the Senate will listen. The majority leader has been gracious enough to include in his unanimous-consent request at the time of the morning hour that the so-called measure which has been engaging our attention will not be motioned up in the morning hour, and I assume that he will give us assurance of that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Absolutely, and I make that unanimous-consent request right now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, may we have the unanimous-consent request clearly stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana will restate his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That it is my intention—and I make the request now—for the next 3 days, that there be a brief morning hour for the transaction of routine morning business, and that statements be limited to 3 minutes, and that the unfinished business not be displaced.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Is it the intention of the majority leader to take up legislation in the morning hour?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If it is unobjected to, but not legislation which the Senator has in mind, I can assure him. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Georgia will be fully protected.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am glad to hear that. The distinguished Senator is psychic. I had other things in mind other than the motion which has been made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will withdraw it—

Mr. JAVITS. No—I think the distinguished Senator misspoke himself when he said "discuss." We all understand it is not to be motioned up, but suppose a Senator wishes to say something about the pending business—

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is nothing to prevent any Senator from speaking about it.

Mr. JAVITS. That is right, but the Senator used the word "discuss" in his unanimous-consent request, which could be taken to mean that it would not be motioned up, which is fine with me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I asked that the unfinished business not be displaced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

**JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TOMORROW**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, all Senators will meet in the Chamber at 12:13

ical care by the physician of his choice. Such action by the hospitals would force Indiana Blue Cross to reconsider the stand it has taken.

"The physicians of the Delaware-Blackford County Medical Society stand ready to serve young and old alike as physicians practising under the long established American system of direct physician-patient relationship without the restrictions of any third party or governmental red tape and bureaucratic interference."

The portion of the Medicare Law which the two counties' doctors believe is being violated reads:

"Nothing in this title (act) shall be construed to authorize any Federal officer or employe to exercise any supervision or control over the practice of medicine or the manner in which medical services are provided, or over the selection, tenure, or compensation of any officer or employe of any institution, agency, or person providing health services; or to exercise any supervision or control over the administration or operation of any such institution, agency or person."

### Cutting the Ho Chi Minh Trail

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as one who has read into last Sunday's elections in South Vietnam a little more importance than have some of my colleagues, I should like to express my pleasure in their outcome.

Though it will undoubtedly be sometime, yet, before we will be able to obtain a clear picture of whether or not that outcome will actually lead to the establishment of a stable, broad-based, popular government in South Vietnam, we can, I believe, hope for the moment that this process has been begun.

Even the New York Times which—as most of us know—has been normally critical of the administration's policy in Vietnam, and which failed to take, in advance thereof, an especially optimistic outlook toward the potential of South Vietnam's go at political self-determination, has had some kind words to say, as witness its lead editorial on Monday of this week:

#### SAIGON'S ELECTORAL VICTORY

The elections in South Vietnam were a success for Marshal Ky's Government and indirectly for the Johnson Administration. According to present available figures, three-quarters of the eligible voters cast ballots. This far exceeds Vietnamese and American hopes before election day.

The victory deserves full acknowledgment, but its effects should not be exaggerated. Candidates were merely elected to an assembly which will draw up a constitution leading to still another election in 1967 or 1968 for as representative a government as the situation and political backwardness of the people will permit.

Since large regions of South Vietnam are under Vietcong control, or subject to the Vietcong's threats, the election could not lead to a genuine popular majority. But, insofar as the South Vietnamese people, at this stage of their history could record a democratic vote, they have done so.

Marshal Ky, himself, has been an in-again-out-again candidate for the office of an elected president, but it is obvious that any future government would have to be either military or, if civilian, willing to prosecute the war. The conflict will go on pretty much as if the election, despite its undoubted value are ripe for negotiations or a truce.

Hanoi's inflexible rejection of President Johnson's offer of a mutually agreed withdrawal of troops from South Vietnam shows that neither the time nor the circumstances are ripe for negotiations or a truce.

The block on the road to peace has been made clear again and again by both sides, as it was in the recent exchange. The United States says that Hanoi is the aggressor and North Vietnam says that Washington is the aggressor. Behind the simple accusations are all the complex forces of power politics, ideology, nationalism and emotions that make the war in Vietnam so stubborn and, for the moment, so intractable.

Yet, the effort to solve it and to bring about negotiations must go on. The United States cannot assume that Hanoi literally means, and always will mean, exactly what it says today. North Vietnam may one day accept the fact that the United States really intends to withdraw from Southeast Asia when circumstances permit, and Hanoi may also hope that the American escalation of the war will not continue to a point of no return.

In the diplomatic game that goes on behind the crack of guns and thunder of bombs, the ideals for which the United States stands gained a point in yesterday's election. The Vietcong, the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists lost by the same margin. The war goes on, but it has been proved that three out of four of those who could vote in South Vietnam braved danger and future risk to do so, and thereby expressed either support for or acquiescence in what the Saigon Government is trying to do.

I do not find much to quarrel with in the Times' analysis—for, of course, it would be unwise to exaggerate the size of this important first step toward making South Vietnam a more effective partner in waging and winning its own war for independence. But I do believe—as does the Times—that "the ideals for which the United States stands gained a point in the election."

Looking beyond that point, however, I would suggest we all now need to consider what effect, if any, the results may have on either our diplomatic or military effort to bring that war to a satisfactory conclusion.

First, as for the diplomatic effort which, as the above editorial says, "goes on behind the crack of guns and thunder of bombs," it would seem as if the United States-South Vietnamese hand has been strengthened, even if only a little. But, given the continuing refusal by the aggressors to consider any proffer of willingness to talk settlement, there is not much new one can suggest here other than to express the hope that the President will keep the diplomatic pressures on the North through every available channel.

On the military front, however, it may be appropriate to ask if the President has adequately considered the possible alternatives to our ever-increasing bombing of the north in an effort to halt infiltration of troops and supplies to the Vietcong. It has been difficult to accurately assess the value of such bombing. Although it may have had an effect on larger troop movements from the

North, as witnessed by the recent dropoff in combat incidents between large North Vietnamese units and allied forces, it does not seem to have accomplished a halt to the supplying of the Vietcong's hit-and-run guerrilla bands that ravage the countryside and terrorize the South Vietnamese people in outlying areas.

If, as seems likely, the Vietcong revert now to these kind of tactics it would also seem as if they could thus prolong the war, no matter how much we step up the punishment bombing we have been relying on in our efforts to halt the overall aggression.

Therefore, with a somewhat improved prospect for a more stable political base to work with now at hand, I wonder if it is not time to again ask for consideration of others means for similarly stabilizing the military front.

Now, certainly, I do not pretend to be any sort of military expert, but I have been interested for sometime in the suggestion that has come from several quarters that an attempt should be made to cut the so-called Ho Chi Minh Trail that passes through Laos and on into South Vietnam.

This would be no mean feat but—considering the engineering miracles worked by the Army Engineers and the Seabees during World War II—not beyond our apparent capabilities. If it could be done—and if it worked—perhaps both the need for escalated bombing of military targets in the North and for more and more U.S. troops in the South could be curtailed.

It's worth a thought, anyway—and, as evidence others are thinking about it still, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for Wednesday, September 7:

#### CUTTING THE HO CHI MINH TRAIL

The continued infiltration of North Vietnamese soldiery into South Vietnam raises with increasing insistence the question of what can be done to end this war-prolonging practice. One of the most effective means of transferring the Vietnamese war from the battlefield to the peace table would be to put a stop to North Vietnam's support of the Viet Cong effort to seize the south by force.

More than eight months ago these columns raised the question of whether the United States should not begin thinking seriously of means to cut the Ho Chi Minh Trail through Laos over which most of these infiltrators pass. At that time we suggested that an effective deterrent be to cut "a no-man's-land swath from the sea to mid-Laos to sever Communist infiltration routes."

We added: "This swath need be no longer than 50 to 75 miles in length. Sown with mines, strung with wire, garnished with artillery and guarded by garrisons, this could be an effective barrier."

The passing of time has only made some such bold enterprise all the most needful. It also remains one of the most painless methods by which the war could be brought under control.

Unlike the bombing of North Vietnam, an interdiction swath would have as its purpose the reduction of fighting rather than its escalation. It would violate no unviolated territory, since it would merely seek to rob North Vietnam of the use of Laotian territory which Hanoi has taken over without so much as a by-your-leave. It would, according to some reports, even be welcomed in Laos which has grown increasingly con-

cerned with the greater and greater use of its territory by North Vietnam.

Cutting such a swath through rugged areas would be no small feat. It would require not an army to protect the work, but a vast crew of workers and an abundance of equipment. But we doubt if it would require as much effort as will be needed to put down the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong without some such halt to infiltration. In any event, if such a swath is considered the best means of ending infiltration, we doubt if it would be beyond the capacity of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

Some way must be found to, first, reduce the scale of fighting in Vietnam, and, then, end it entirely. We hope that the White House and the Pentagon will give serious consideration to some such plan for ending infiltration.

Mr. Speaker, at the heart of our problem in Vietnam lies the need for us to help create a climate of security, now, for the people of South Vietnam—in which, at long last, their hamlets, villages, and cities can be so organized as to be immune from terrorist attack, and free to resume the tranquillity of peasant life.

We are now endeavoring, as I understand it, to link up certain pacified areas along the coast near Da Nang, as well as the numerous hamlets elsewhere that have become pacified under the effort made by our Army Special Forces, so-called.

But, on the whole, a complete picture along these lines has yet to emerge. The failures of the past—especially of the so-called strategic hamlet program, as columnist Richard Wilson has recently pointed out in the Evening Star here in Washington—have seemed to paralyze the thinking of the administration to come up with anything better for the future.

As Mr. Wilson further stated:

Security, security, security is the essential ingredient, and that does not exist (in South Vietnam, now) except in special areas.

And, then he concludes his column in last Monday's Star by saying:

(This) is mainly a political war, unlike any we ever fought before; a war in which generals must concern themselves not only with military strategy but with civic action and political and economic reconstruction.

Mr. Speaker, I agree—and I believe it is time we took another look at what we could do, what new policy we could come up with, under which we could promote the security of the people of South Vietnam for, on our ability to do so, now probably depends such victory as we can hope for.

### The President's Response to Vietnam Peace Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on September 6, 1966, I addressed my colleagues in the House on the subject of Vietnam—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, A4673—and outlined a seven-point peace conference

proposal, which I sent by letter to the President.

I am very pleased to place in the RECORD at this point the text of the President's response to my proposal:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, September 7, 1966.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TENZER: I thank you for your thoughtful letter of August 31.

All of us want to see the earliest possible establishment of peace in Viet Nam, a peace that will leave the brave and long-suffering people of South Viet Nam masters in their own land, free from terror and intimidation, free from external aggression, and free to create their own political and economic institutions. No one would be happier than I to see the earliest possible achievement of that goal.

You know of the intensive and extensive efforts we have made to bring the fighting to a close and to settle this matter by peaceful means. Those efforts continue, often quietly and away from the glare of publicity.

But, as you know, every effort to date has encountered a loud and abusive rejection from Hanoi and from Peking. Most recently, Foreign Minister Thanat of Thailand and other leaders in Asia proposed an Asian conference to work toward peace in Viet Nam. The Communists' reaction was swift and totally negative.

Nonetheless, we and others who genuinely seek peace will persist in its pursuit.

I have asked my advisers to study your specific proposal and to give it the careful consideration it merits.

Meantime, I thank you for your consideration and for the solid work you have carried out in the past Congress. I know the good people of your District recognize the great efforts you have made in their behalf and in behalf of our nation.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the President's reply and by the communications commenting on the peace conference proposal from several of my colleagues, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., September 6, 1966.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,  
House of Representatives,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERB: I should like to compliment you on the proposals for a Vietnam peace conference which you have made to the President. These proposals embody various points which seem to me to be crucial to any effort to give reality to the President's obvious desire to get peace talks started: first, acceptance of the NLF in the conference as a party in its own right; second, a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam; and third, the offer of a cease-fire.

I think your letter is a most constructive contribution to the national dialogue on this subject, and I hope it will be given the attention and study that it deserves.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., September 6, 1966.  
The Honorable HERBERT TENZER,  
House Office Building.

DEAR HERBERT: Your reasoned letter to the President on breaking the impasse to negotiations in Viet Nam is a significant contribution to the cause of peace. As you so eloquently state, the present course of the war is of the deepest concern to many of us, par-

ticularly because the momentum of military escalation seems to have outdistanced diplomatic initiative on both sides.

And as you have so wisely stated, now is the occasion to begin to find a way toward settlement by peaceful means. Your suggestions on how this country might initiate a peace conference deserve the greatest consideration—serious and rational consideration—and should not be rejected merely on the ground that past peace initiatives from this side have failed or been rejected.

I commend you on your initiative and your statesmanlike approach to this most complicated of all American and world problems today, one that is only susceptible to solution through forbearance, sensitivity, good judgment and introspection by all parties involved.

With every warm best wish,  
Yours,

JAMES H. SCHEUER,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., September 8, 1966.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Longworth Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERB: A copy of your fine letter of August 31 to the President, which contains your recommendations to him for peace in Vietnam, has come across my desk.

As one who has declared frequently in favor of fresh initiatives towards peace in Vietnam, I want to applaud the imaginative outreach of your plan. I heartily endorse the steps you recommend and will be glad to lend further support if it will help in any way.

My kindest regards.  
Sincerely,

JOHN G. DOW.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., September 8, 1966.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have read with much interest and considerable attention your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, September 6th, dealing with your proposal for a Vietnam Peace Conference.

I want to commend you for taking the initiative in this area, and would like you to know that I am in complete agreement with you that it is urgent for us to increase our efforts to bring about a reciprocal deescalation of military activities in Vietnam, and a cease-fire, and to approach the termination of our own military involvement.

In my judgment, it is absolutely essential that the President take the first step in the areas you have outlined. I hope he will give his serious consideration to your suggestions and recommendations.

Again let me congratulate you for your leadership in the submission of such a constructive proposal.

My best wishes.  
Sincerely,

BEN ROSENTHAL.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1966.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,  
Longworth House Office Building.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have received a copy of your letter to the President under date of August 31, 1966 regarding Vietnam. It is an outstanding document and I want you to know how deeply I appreciate having the benefit of your cogent and persuasive reasoning.

I believe your suggestions of setting a time and place for a peace conference, making it



open to all parties to the conflict, with a cease fire to follow within a stated time, could be the magnanimous gesture that would force a reciprocal peaceful overture from the other side. Surely, such an offer carries little risk and the chances are substantial of a thaw in the present frozen positions. I most earnestly hope that the President agrees with you and act accordingly. In any case I know how grateful he is to receive constructive and creative letters like yours. Many of your friends in the House of Representatives are grateful too.

Please accept my personal thanks and appreciation.

Sincerely,

DON EDWARDS,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to receive comments and suggestions from other of my colleagues concerning this proposal.

Only by continuing the dialog and debate will it be possible to create the climate necessary to transfer the conflict from the battlefield to the conference table.

This I believe is our Nation's policy.

The peaceful settlement of disputes is an objective in the proudest of American diplomatic tradition.

### Suspension of Investment Tax Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the President for his action last Thursday in advocating suspension of the investment tax credit. I am confident that the details of his proposal will receive careful scrutiny in the Ways and Means Committee to insure reasonable growth for the economy while not disrupting bona fide business procedures.

The dislocations in the economy—particularly the impact of tight money on housing and lumber—must not be underestimated, and a broad range of monetary and fiscal actions must be taken. We may also need to consider other corporate tax increases, Presidential authority to institute consumer installment credit controls, and appropriate action by the Federal Reserve Board to ease the burden of their monetary restraints.

There is no doubt that corporate investment in plants and equipment—which the latest figures show to be 17 percent ahead of 1965, and 55 percent greater than this spending in 1963—is one of the inflationary stimulants in our economy. It is also worthwhile to consider the impact of corporate expansion plans for foreign trade and our balance-of-payments situation.

We have had too much of a good thing—the increase in investment has got out of hand—it has been a key factor in the overall surge in imports and, in particular, the sharp jump in imports of machinery during the past year.

In the first half of this year, U.S. im-

ports of capital equipment were up 44 percent over the January to June period of 1965. Imports of metalworking machinery were up 89 percent in 1 year. Imports of textile machinery soared by 71 percent. This can only be ascribed to the inflated rise in demand for investment goods.

Our exports of capital equipment have been cut for the same reason. In the machine tool industry foreign orders so far in 1966 have run 39 percent above a year ago, but shipments abroad are lagging behind by 17 percent. The foreign orders are being put at the bottom of the pile so that domestic orders can be filled.

The only way we can strengthen the dollar internationally—stop the dollar drain and the loss of gold—is to restore a strong trade balance. This means less imports and more exports. Both can be achieved by dampening the investment boom by withdrawing temporarily the investment tax credit.

Restoring a favorable trade balance is another reason why we should thank the President for proposing the suspension of the unnecessary bonus which the investment credit provides before our economy experiences even more severe dislocations.

### Rosh Hashanah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today, September 14, at sundown, begins the 10-day period of the Jewish high holy days and the Jewish year of 5727.

The moving religious significance of this period is not only meaningful to the world Jewish community, but it is a reminder of the lasting contributions to world civilization by our Jewish brothers.

This 10-day period is also known as the "Days of Awe." Certainly all of us need to pause along with our Jewish brothers in awe at the greatness of God and the wonders of his works.

These are troubled times for our Nation and for the world. The revolution of rising expectations among the deprived of the world has not yet attained fulfillment.

The mountains of bigotry, poverty, and misunderstanding still stands between the ocean of brotherhood and the prairie of peace. We have not yet learned to enjoy each other's proximity.

As we stumble about in the darkness of ignorance seeking solutions to the racial crises of our Nation and the conflict in Vietnam, let us reaffirm our faith in the oneness of God and our love for His children, our fellow man.

As a Baptist minister and one of the only three clergymen in both bodies, I can think of no more appropriate thoughts for Rosh Hashanah than those expressed by our first President, George Washington, to the Hebrew congregation in Newport, R.I., in 1790:

May the Children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of other inhabitants; while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the Father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us in our several vocations useful here, and in His own due time and everlastingly happy.

### District of Columbia Home Rule Is National Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Thomas Lane, U.S. Army, retired, a former Commissioner of the District of Columbia, has some perceptive comments on the question of home rule for the District.

As General Lane points out in his syndicated newspaper column, the issue of civil rights is a false issue as far as the home rule argument is concerned. The District was created to provide security for the Government of all the people—not to provide for the comfort and convenience of its residents. I believe his comments deserve careful consideration:

PUBLIC AFFAIRS: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE IS NATIONAL ISSUE

(By Gen. Thomas Lane, US Army, retired)

WASHINGTON.—There is a widespread and mistaken notion that Home Rule for the District of Columbia is of concern primarily to District residents. In reality, it primarily concerns all the other citizens of the United States.

The founding fathers were keenly aware of the experience of Rome where the city mobs installed and deposed rulers without regard to the rest of the Empire. That is why they set aside the District of Columbia as the seat of the federal government and prescribed in the Constitution that the Congress should "exercise exclusive legislation" therein. The District was created to provide security for the government of all the people—not to provide for the comfort and convenience of its residents.

Congress has used various forms for governing the District of Columbia. After the Civil War, the territorial government then ruling incurred heavy indebtedness for public works programs. After the financial crisis of 1873, the local government was unable to meet its bonded obligations. Its debts were assumed by Congress, which then established a Commission government more responsive to congressional control. The Commission government has endured until now.

In recent years, there has been a growing movement for Home Rule, defined as local government with an elected Council and an elected or appointed Mayor or Governor. Because of the growing negro proportion of the capital population, this movement has assumed aspects of a political drive to restore civil rights to disfranchised negroes.

This is a false issue. Racial considerations had no weight in the adoption of the Commission government. They are today a political tool of men who would use local government to pressure the Congress of the United States. Residents of the District of Columbia have never had and do not now have rights of local self-government enjoyed by citizens of the fifty states. Those who

live in the District must accept and live under the legislative rule of Congress.

Except during the Civil War, the safety of the seat of federal government has not been threatened. Today, however, we note a growing trend to mob rule in the cities of America. We are entering that era of political disintegration which the founding fathers foresaw when they created the federal district. This would indeed be a strange hour for the Congress to transfer responsibility for law and order in the District of Columbia to its residents.

The present need is for tighter control by Congress. Executive encroachment upon the Commission government has exposed District affairs to the political expediencies of the ruling party. Congress must protect its home from the corroding effects of partisan politics. It must do so without involving the whole Congress in details of local government.

The true purpose of the District might be better served by creating a government with a District Council composed of six members of Congress and a Governor appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. The Council would also constitute the Joint Committee of the Congress on the District of Columbia and it should be given powers of local legislation which have never been delegated to the Commissioners.

A Council composed of Representatives and Senators would emphasize the federal character of the District. Residents would remain where they are and should be—without any control of local government. For the Government of the District of Columbia must represent not just its residents but all the people of the United States.

Tell your Congressman to keep it that way.

### Best Wishes to Those of Jewish Faith on Rosh Hashanah

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate during these days of awe that I extend my most sincere wishes to those of the Jewish faith. This great section of the American population through day-to-day adherence to the principles of the Old Testament, has greatly contributed to the moral and intellectual growth of our Nation, over the past year, the past decade, the past two centuries.

As men of good will everywhere grope for peace and understanding, may the current observance of Rosh Hashanah bring new hope and new inspiration to the Jewish people, in order that the worthy ideals of Judaism may prosper in the coming year.

I would also like, at this time, to join in asking the blessing of God upon the Republic of Israel and in praying that its people may be strengthened in their struggle to maintain a bulwark of freedom in a land redeemed through heroism, courage and great sacrifice.

I ask my fellow Americans of the Jewish faith to accept my best wishes for health, happiness, and the delights of accomplishment during the coming year, as well as the hopeful vision of tasks to be attempted and goals to be approached through the years to follow.

### It's Your Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 1966

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, after sober reflection, I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial entitled "Pay Attention to Government; It's Your Way of Life." Appearing in the Zion-Benton News, Zion, Ill., on September 8, 1966, this article hammers against one's defenses as only truth can do. The editor, Lee Fleming, has given a lifetime to an example of citizenship each of us would be proud to have provided. His patriotism is an outstanding illustration of "I could not love thee half so much, loved I not honor more."

The editorial follows:

PAY ATTENTION TO GOVERNMENT; IT'S YOUR WAY OF LIFE

Government is important, very important to all the people and this is a reason that people must give lots of attention to government.

Government is an organized procedure making it possible for large masses of people to live together. Government is to make the rules and enforce the rules governing the conduct of people so they may be safe, secure and enjoy their rights of freedom—so long as they do not interfere with others who also have rights of freedom.

The Government of the United States has, in the past, carried out this responsibility in a way that has made it the envy of the world, the desire of most foreigners and the acme of human rights and individual freedom.

Recently, United States Government has been failing to do those things which made the U.S. Government great. It has started doing many things which, in other nations have brought poverty, dictatorship and ruin to them and their people. The present Johnson Administration is more guilty than has been any administration preceding him.

Easily proven charges can be made against the present Federal Government. People should be aware of these failures of both omission and commission because it is the people who pay in the loss of prosperity, happiness and freedom.

1. They have sent hundreds of thousands of men into a war they admit they do not intend to win and end, but that they intend to hold and die.

2. They have created inflation by continuing and increasing a political spending program in addition to a war cost. No other plan could harm the individual so much.

3. They have jeopardized the value of the U.S. dollar by continuing foreign nation give-away programs which create a dangerous imbalance of exchange resulting in the loss of U.S. gold.

4. They have caused an increase in the cost of everything we buy by paying people for not working and for not farming.

5. They have set wage ceilings which reduce jobs and production, increasing costs and adding to inflation.

6. They have set up a series of grandiose schemes, poverty wars, public housing, rent subsidies and others which have hired partisan politicians at wages \$18,000 to \$20,000 and \$25,000 a year, three and four times the wages of school teachers, nurses, technicians and many others who render a worthwhile service.

7. They have coddled and appeased organized, selfish minority groups to buy their

votes, but at the expense of the general public.

8. They have created a condition comparable with a police state in the Internal Revenue Bureau.

9. They have saddled the people, both businesses and individual, with a multitude of paper forms so complicated that most people must hire a specialist to fill them in.

10. They have failed to do their most simple duty—maintain law and order in the streets.

11. Congress has abdicated its responsibility and endowed the Executive Branch bureaucrats with law making powers in the guise of writing the rules.

12. The Supreme Court has assumed the power of legislation and is creating laws by off-beat interpretations. Communism has grown and thrived because of these decisions. Criminals roam the streets with impunity because of this. Rioting, pillage and even murder in the streets is promoted and condoned by these interpretations.

These iniquities and injustices are not to be cured by being Democrat or Republican. They will be cured when the people, every last one of them, vote for the good of the nation. When they select a candidate who pledges to return to responsible, Constitutional government. When people will honestly consider, "What they can do for our government, not what the government can do for them."

### President Ferdinand Marcos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today Washington will welcome to the United States a distinguished Chief of State and gallant war hero, Ferdinand P. Marcos, President of the Republic of the Philippines. I share the opinion of many who acknowledge President Marcos to be one of the outstanding leaders in the world today. He and his vibrant young Republic are a major force in Asia in the struggle against communism. I am pleased that President Marcos and his lovely First Lady, Imelda, are visiting our country. I commend to you the fine article written by Crosby S. Noyes which appeared in the Washington Star on September 13, 1966:

MARCOS A FINE EXAMPLE OF NEW ASIAN LEADERS

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

In the normal course of things, official visits by foreign heads of state have so little impact on relations between countries as to be a conspicuous waste of everybody's time. There are, however, rare exceptions.

The arrival here this week of President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines promises to be one of these. For a variety of reasons, some personal and some circumstantial, Marcos' 17-day visit is likely to be an event of genuine importance to both countries.

A good deal of it is a simple matter of communication.

Whether he is talking to President Johnson or a nationwide television audience or the National Press Club or a joint session of Congress—all of which are on the schedule—Marcos will come across loud and clear. As