

H.R. 13111. A bill to amend section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code to permit the use of officers of any of the services or qualified attorneys on claims commissions, and for other purposes; and to amend section 2734a of title 10 to authorize use of Coast Guard appropriations for certain claim settlements arising out of Coast Guard activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 13112. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide certain parking privileges for physically disabled persons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 13113. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13114. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to provide that the Federal National Mortgage Association may sell participations in the Government mortgage liquidation trust (or any similar undertaking or activity) only so long as it is limited to FHA-insured and VA-insured or VA-guaranteed mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13115. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 13116. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on certain nonmalleable iron castings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13117. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 13118. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 13119. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental retardation facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13120. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 13121. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13122. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13123. A bill to amend chapter 207, title 18, United States Code, to prescribe procedure for the return of persons who have fled, in violation of the conditions of bail given in any State or judicial district of the United States, to another State or judicial district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 13124. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 13125. A bill to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 13126. A bill to prohibit the advertising in commerce of trips on foreign-flag vessels unless the advertisements make certain statements in connection therewith; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 13127. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13128. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Federal Aviation Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 13129. A bill to provide at least a 5-year period during which educational assistance under chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, may be afforded a person attaining eligibility solely by virtue of section 3 of Public Law 89-222; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 13130. A bill to provide for the best care, welfare, and safeguards against suffering for certain animals used for scientific purposes without impeding necessary research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 13131. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13132. A bill to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act to extend the armed services housing mortgage insurance program and provide additional authority thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13133. A bill to grant, subject to certain conditions, a preference right of reentry under the desert land laws to entrymen, their heirs or assigns, with desertland entries within the Imperial Irrigation and Coachella Valley County Water Districts, where such entries have been canceled subsequent to December 1, 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.J. Res. 851. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 852. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

401. By the SPEAKER: a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to discontinuing further consideration of H.R. 11798 relating to taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

402. Also, memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to establishment of a national cemetery in central Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

403. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas, relative to supporting U.S. policy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

404. Also, memorial of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, relative to resolutions and recommendations of the 11th An-

nual Conference held in New York, October 4-8, 1965; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 13134. A bill for the relief of Nora Austin Hendrickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 13135. A bill for the relief of Maria Trinidad Perez Villagomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13136. A bill for the relief of Kiamarz Eshghi and Pouran Ragadypour Eshghi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 13137. A bill for the relief of Vered Baum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 13138. A bill for the relief of Carlos Soto Baez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13139. A bill for the relief of Masakiyo Kuzumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13140. A bill for the relief of Letterio Arcadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13141. A bill for the relief of Mervin H. S. Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 13142. A bill for the relief of Byung Yuk Yu and Myoung Ja Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

335. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to appropriations for land-grant colleges and universities, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Brig. F. M. Gaugh, city commander, the Salvation Army, Birmingham, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, our Heavenly Father, look down in mercy upon this Senate and bless all the Members present or absent.

We ask for Thy guidance. We have looked into the atom, and no one knows the day or the hour when all may be changed, even the heavens and the earth.

Help us to invest ourselves without delay in the redemption of the human race, beginning where we are and giving our all so that we may gain that which can never be taken away.

Quicken our imagination, fortify our wills, and drive us beyond the security of self-concern into the struggle for truth and justice.

Give us the courage to express in our actions what we believe in our hearts.

Order our thoughts that they may be charitable, our tongues that they may be controlled, and our lips that they may be clean.

Grant us, O Lord, the spirit of Him who is Master of us all, yet who dwelt among men as one who served.

And so direct us in our doings and relationships that, following Him, we may spend ourselves for the good of our brethren.

For we ask it in Thy name. Amen.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Because the Senate adjourned on Saturday without a quorum being present, the Chair directs the clerk to call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

	[No. 38 Leg.]	
Aiken	Hartke	Murphy
Allott	Hayden	Muskie
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Bartlett	Hill	Neuberger
Bass	Holland	Pastore
Bayh	Hruska	Pearson
Bennett	Inouye	Pell
Bible	Jackson	Prouty
Boggs	Javits	Proxmire
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, S.C.
Cannon	Kuchel	Russell, Ga.
Case	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Clark	Long, La.	Scott
Cooper	Magnuson	Simpson
Cotton	Mansfield	Smathers
Curtis	McCarthy	Smith
Dirksen	McClellan	Sparkman
Dominick	McGee	Stennis
Douglas	McGovern	Symington
Eastland	McIntyre	Talmadge
Ervin	McNamara	Thurmond
Fannin	Metcalf	Tower
Fong	Mondale	Tydings
Fulbright	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Gruning	Morse	Yarborough
Harris	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Mundt	Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 26, 1966, was dispensed with.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under rule VIII, I ask unanimous con-

sent to waive the call of the calendar of measures that are not objected to.

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

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS IN MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made in the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committee and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Allen Moe, of New York, to be Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Public Health Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately

notified of the nominations today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 21, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1698) to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 388)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966, relating to water pollution. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of certain water pollution control functions.

Thirty-five years ago Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said:

A river is more than an amenity, it is a treasure.

Only recently has the truth of this observation entered the public conscience. For we now recognize that the Nation's rivers, far from being treasured, have been carelessly neglected for too long.

Today we face a harsh reality. Our waters are burdened with blight. We know that every river system in America suffers from some degree of pollution. This menace is growing more serious with every passing day.

We have just begun to take the steps to clean and restore our waters.

The task is immense. The journey will be long.

If our new programs are to succeed we must combine our efforts—Federal, State, local, and private—in new and creative partnerships.

The attack against water pollution should be unified and coordinated.

It should be carried forward as an integral part of comprehensive planning for the development of river basins.

But most importantly, the Government's management structure must be strengthened and reshaped to meet the challenges that lie ahead.

In my February 23 message on the quality of our environment, I stated:

We must reorganize the Federal effort. In the past, the Federal antipollution effort has been organizationally separate from water conservation and use programs.

One agency should assume leadership in our clean water effort.

That agency should be the Department of the Interior.

The Department of the Interior, for many years, has been concerned with the comprehensive management and development of the Nation's water resources.

It plans, constructs, and operates multiple-purpose water and related land resources projects.

It carries on research and development on the removal of minerals from water.

It administers the Water Resources Research Act.

The Secretary of the Interior also serves as Chairman of the Water Resources Council responsible for coordinating river basin planning. Under the Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966 and other legislation which I have recently proposed, the Secretary will become the focal point for Federal efforts in this area.

It is wise management to place under his control the related resources and authority now in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The reorganization plan maintains a proper and effective role for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to the health aspects of pollution. At the same time it places in the Department of the Interior all of the necessary tools to move forward the drive to clean America's waters.

The reorganization plan herewith transmitted will transfer to the Secretary of the Interior the functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act except for responsibilities relating to public health for which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has special competence. That Department will retain responsibility under section 3(b) of the act for advising on public health questions involved in determinations by Federal agencies of the need for and value of the inclusion of storage for water quality control in Federal reservoirs. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration would be transferred to the Department of the Interior.

The Secretary of the Interior in administering the act will also be required to consult with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on public health aspects relating to water pollution. This consultative responsibility is now vested in the Surgeon General by section 2(k) of the Water Quality Act of 1965. The plan transfers that responsibility to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Water Pollution Control Advisory Board and the hearing boards provided for in the act would be transferred to the Department of the Interior, together with their respective functions. The reorganization plan also makes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a member of the Advisory Board and gives him the opportunity to select a member of each hearing board.

The reorganization plan would in no way impair the rights and benefits of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service who may transfer to the Water Pollution Control Administration.

The reorganization to be accomplished by the plan transmitted herewith will enable the Federal Government to organize for action against pollution on a river basin basis under the unified leadership of the Secretary of the Interior.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the accompanying reorganization plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that it is necessary to include in the accompanying reorganization plan, by reason of the reorganizations made thereby, provision for the membership of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board and for the appointment and compensation of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior. The rate of compensation fixed for that officer is that which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

The reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith will produce significant long-range savings and economies by reason of the efficiencies in organization and in the elimination of duplication of effort it will bring about. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

I recommend that the Congress allow the accompanying plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 1966.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S. 577. An act for the relief of Mary F. Morse;

S. 851. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan;

H.R. 5831. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass and cement

windows for Our Lady of the Angels Seminary of Glenmont, N.Y.;

H.R. 10185. An act amending certain estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939;

H.R. 10625. An act relating to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of the uniformed services and to their survivors;

H.R. 11006. An act to extend the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability;

H.R. 11007. An act to provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, or during a vacancy in that office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11747. An act to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization and other institutional care; and

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

NATIONAL VISITOR CENTER ACT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a National Visitor Center, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the fourth quarter of 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INSURANCE AND GUARANTEES ON U.S. EXPORTS TO YUGOSLAVIA

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of January 1966, not previously reported, totaled \$884,699; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF ACTING COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report relative to aircraft under the military assistance program for the Republic of China (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for post award audits to detect lack of disclosure of significant cost or pricing data available prior to contract negotiation and award, Department of Defense, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California,

to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR THE U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on amendments to the rules of civil procedure for the U.S. district courts, adopted by the Supreme Court (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE FOR THE U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on amendments to the rules of criminal procedure for the U.S. district courts, adopted by the Supreme Court (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLEAN RIVERS RESTORATION ACT OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a program of pollution control and abatement in selected river basins of the United States through comprehensive planning and financial assistance, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATION OR ACQUISITION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of construction, alteration or acquisition of public buildings, dated December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of all expenditures from moneys appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Orange County, Fla., protesting against the transfer of the Manned Orbital Laboratory from Cape Kennedy, Fla., to the Vandenberg Air Force Base in California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Commission of the city of Cocoa Beach, Fla., protesting against the transfer of the basic manned orbiting laboratory program at Cape Kennedy, to Vandenberg Air Force Base in California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from O'Neal W. Chandler, of Daytona Beach, Fla., remonstrating against the foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, held in New York City; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by citizens of Lithuanian descent, at a meeting of the Lithuanian Council of Miami, Fla., relating to the restoration of Lithuania's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Richard Paul Pavlick, of Concord, N.H., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL COURT OF COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution of the general court of Massachusetts favoring the establishment of a national cemetery in central Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES IN FAVOR OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN CENTRAL MASSACHUSETTS

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary for the establishment of a national cemetery in central Massachusetts; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, February 9, 1966.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,

Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 14, 1966.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK,

Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 2985. A bill for the relief of Hill County, Mont.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2986. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE.

S. 2987. A bill to provide a program of pollution control and abatement in selected river basins of the United States through comprehensive planning and financial assistance, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUSKIE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HART, Mr. BREWSTER, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 2988. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2989. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communication common carriers; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 2990. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to provide an exemption for county fairs and other agricultural or horticultural fairs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2991. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. CLARK, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 2992. A bill to authorize the use of foreign currencies to finance family planning programs in friendly foreign nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 2993. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and to private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution relating to the right of a State to enact legislation on the basis of its own public policy on questions of decency and morality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Office of Emergency Planning, a bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2986) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1966.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes. It is proposed that the act be extended 4 years to June 30, 1970.

The Defense Production Act, which became law on September 8, 1950, has served to support and facilitate the defense program in many ways. As originally enacted it was the authority for virtually all economic mobilization measures taken during the Korean hostilities. Provisions for price and wage controls and related credit controls were allowed to lapse in 1953 when inflationary pressures subsided. The authority to require that production for the national defense be given preference over other business has continued to be used during the subsequent decade of cold war stress and extraordinary military expenditures. It is now being used to an increasing extent to meet problems arising as a result of hostilities in South Vietnam, and will be used to an even greater extent if the impact of those hostilities becomes greater. Continuous use has also been made of the authority provided by the act to guarantee production loans on Government contracts for the production of weapons and other defense supplies. A reserve of executives from private life is organized and trained for emergency employment by the Government under authority of the act. These active programs are essential to the support of current national defense activities to our readiness to meet future emergencies which may occur. The need for them will undoubtedly remain for a number of years.

Programs for the expansion of productive capacity under title III of the act have been inactive for some time but, as indicated by the Congress when it last extended the act in 1964, the existence of these authorities in the event of a future emergency is of importance to the national defense. We are not proposing any amendments to this title although, as we have pointed out in the past, the financial condition of the borrowing authority under section 304 of the act causes us concern. It is probable that within the next few years the fund will have deteriorated to such a point as to require an appropriation to avoid a fiscal deficit.

The authorities in the act serve essential needs of the current military, space, and Atomic Energy Commission programs and provide a firm basis for the maintenance of a defense readiness posture capable of meeting the needs of a larger national defense effort should they develop. Since the need for both current and readiness programs will continue for some time, it is proposed that the Act be extended for 4 years to June 30, 1970.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this bill would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

It is respectfully requested that it be introduced in order that it may be considered for enactment.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN B. DRYDEN,
Acting Director.

THE CLEAN RIVERS RESTORATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and to develop our pollution control and abatement program under a coordinated, river basin approach. The legislation was forwarded to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, February 25, 1966, as part of the administration's proposals to implement the President's February 23, 1966, message on "preserving our natural heritage." This legislation will be considered by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works at the time of its hearings on S. 2947 and related bills dealing with water pollution.

It is reassuring evidence of the President's determination to provide strong Executive leadership in dealing with this critical national problem. He is clearly determined to generate substantially increased momentum toward the objective of clean water.

There are three principal features in the administration bill.

One provides for the development of coordinated pollution control and abatement programs in selected river basins. This proposal is based partially on the Water Quality Act of 1965. It would, in effect, tie eligibility for Federal sewage treatment construction assistance to participation in a river basin plan which includes the use of water quality standards, expanded enforcement and long-term local financing arrangements.

The second major feature is a tightening of enforcement procedures, including a reduction in the time required to implement enforcement actions under the present act, authorization for subpoena powers for the Secretary in connection with enforcement procedures, provision for citizen's suits in Federal district courts where damage from pollution is alleged, and expansion of the authority of the Secretary in setting water quality standards.

Finally, the bill provides for some increases in Federal assistance for sewage treatment construction, an increase in Federal assistance in State pollution control programs and an increase in the authorization for Federal water pollution control research.

The President's proposals are far reaching. They provide additional evidence of his concern with the conservation of the quality of our environment. Taken with the other proposals before us they offer the Congress an opportunity to build an imaginative and sound water quality improvement program on the foundation of the Water Quality Act we developed and enacted last year.

I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2987) to provide a program of pollution control and abatement in selected river basins of the United States through comprehensive planning and financial assistance, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MUSKIE is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL

A bill to provide a program of pollution control and abatement in selected river basins of the United States through comprehensive planning and financial assistance, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes

TITLE I

Section 101

This section provides a short title; namely, the "Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966."

Section 102

This section contains congressional findings: first, that the Nation's natural waters have become dumping grounds for industrial and domestic wastes and the sewage of our communities; second, that the people of the United States are concerned about the potentially harmful effects of these waters on our health, and about the quality of these waters for our resource needs; third, that there is an immediate need to control and eliminate water pollution through the construction of coordinated treatment works and sewer facilities if they are to be restored to adequate standards of quality; fourth, that the present Federal pollution control grant programs concentrate on providing assistance on a municipality-by-municipality basis; and fifth, that these programs need to be supplemented by a wider based program; namely, one aimed at restoring the quality of an entire river basin or basins.

Congress then declares that the purpose of the Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966 is to initiate and carry out in selected river basins of the Nation a program that supplements other water pollution control programs, that provides for maximum cooperation on the part of National, State, interstate, and local governmental units, and that will be directed at reclaiming and restoring the quality of the Nation's rivers, lakes, streams, estuaries, bays, and coastal waters.

Section 103

Subsection (a) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to designate or establish a planning agency on his own initiative for a river basin or basins or portions thereof to be selected by him for the purpose of this act. He may also designate or establish such an agency if the Governors of one or more States located within a selected river basin request him to do so. If a River Basin Commission is established by the President under the Water Resources Planning Act (79 Stat. 244), it is expected that, in most cases, the planning agency for river basin planning under this act will be that River Basin Commission.

The Secretary, in his discretion, could, however, designate some other organization to plan, if that organization adequately represents the various National, State, interstate, and local interests in the selected river basin or basins, and if that organization is capable from a practical and technical standpoint of preparing a plan that will adequately and effectively carry out the purpose of this act.

Subsection (b) directs the Secretary to select for planning purposes only river basins where all the Governors of the States wherein the basin or basins are located agree in advance of planning to seek such legislation as may be necessary to carry out a plan and, in particular, to carry out subsections 104(e) (1), (2), and (3) of this act.

Section 104

Once designated, subsection (a) directs the planning agency to develop a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan for the selected river basin or basins. The plan must be consistent with or part of a comprehensive river basin and related land resources plan being prepared or in existence for the selected river basin or basins or portions thereof.

The plan must include a provision for water-quality standards applicable to the entire basin which are consistent with the criteria set forth in section 10(c)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for such standards. Thus, the standards must, among other things, be designed to protect the public health, enhance water quality, and take into consideration the use and value of water for such things as public water supply, fish and wildlife, agriculture, and industrial uses. The plan must provide for the use of adequate enforcement measures to maintain these standards. It must provide that the local or interstate bodies within areas designated geographically by the plan shall organize, plan, construct, operate, and maintain treatment works and water and sewer facilities, or share the cost thereof with other public or private agencies, so as to provide the most effective and economic means of developing for the entire basin or for areas within such basin systems for the collection, storage, treatment, purification, and distribution of water and wastes. The plan must also provide for a permanent body with effective jurisdiction coextensive with the area covered by the plan. This body will have among its responsibilities water and related land resources regulation and enforcement authority and authority to coordinate the implementation of, and to review and update, the plan.

In addition, the plan will provide that the local or interstate bodies constructing and operating treatment works and water and sewer facilities must obtain the necessary and adequate authority, if they lack it, (1) to take actions necessary to carry out the purpose of this act, (2) to raise capital through the sale of revenue or other bonds or through other authorized methods, including the guarantee of bonds, (3) to levy water and sewer and sewage collection and treatment, and disposal charges which will cover the costs of these services, including capital costs, and (4) to use an effective metering system which will have the threefold purpose of conserving water, preventing or minimizing wastes, and serve as a basis for establishing water and sewer and waste treatment charges. These bodies will then have the capability of adopting sound financial programs designed to maintain water quality in the basin in accordance with the plan and to assure the future expansion and replacement of the works and facilities constructed under the plan without further Federal assistance.

The plan will also include such other provisions as the planning agency believes may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Subsection (b) directs the planning agency, in preparing a plan for the basin, to consider the possibility of effluent charges on public and private entities discharging wastes into the waters of the basin or basins covered by the plan.

Section 105

When the planning agency completes the plan, this section directs that agency to transmit the proposed plan to the heads of the Federal and interstate agencies represented on the planning agency and to the Governor of each State represented on the planning agency. If the plan affects an international boundary water or river crossing such boundary over which an international commission has jurisdiction, then the planning agency will transmit it to the United States section of the commission for review. Each agency, etc., will have 90 days to review the plan and submit views and recommendations thereon. The planning agency may then consider these and make appropriate changes or modifications and then submit the plan to the Secretary of the Interior.

In some instances where the planning agency has completed a meaningful part of the plan, it may be desirable and appropriate to submit such portion for review. In such instances, it may be desirable to proceed with the development of needed treatment works and water and sewer facilities based on this interim plan to prevent a potential pollution problem in a basin or to prevent a worsening of existing pollution in a basin or basins. This section permits such measures.

Section 106

Subsection (a) provides for the transmittal by the Secretary of the Interior of the completed plan or interim plan to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and to the Water Resources Council.

Subsection (b) directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review the plan to determine its effectiveness in guarding and improving human health.

Subsection (c) directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to review the plan to determine its effect on the comprehensively planned development of the metropolitan area or areas included in the proposed plan or interim plan. A metropolitan area is usually a standard metropolitan statistical area designated by the Bureau of the Budget and adjusted to include only urbanized and urbanizing areas.

Subsection (d) directs the Water Resources Council to consider whether the plan is consistent with or part of a comprehensive river basin water and related land resources plan for the basin which is being prepared or is in existence. The Council is particularly concerned with the relationship of the plan to the conservation of water in the basin and to the optimum development and use of the water and related land resources therein.

Subsection (e) directs the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare and Housing and Urban Development and the Council to notify the Secretary of the Interior of the results of their review.

Subsection (f) directs the Secretary of the Interior to review the proposed plan or interim plan to determine that it substantially complies with section 104 of the act. If it does, he shall approve it. If it does not, he will return it with his comments.

Section 107

When a completed plan is approved subsection (a) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept applications from local or interstate bodies located within a river basin or basins or portions thereof covered by the plan and to make grants to them to assist in the financing of the development costs of various treatment works necessary to carry out the plan. The Secretary can also accept applications and make grants based on an interim plan or reports, if he finds that the

interim comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan is substantially completed and if the applications are consistent with such a plan. The grants are subject to a number of limitations.

First, the maximum amount of a grant shall be 30 percent of the estimated development costs of the treatment works. This limitation will not, however, apply to grants made for Appalachia and for economic development areas under the appropriate laws. Similarly, this limitation will not apply in the case of supplemental grants made under the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966 now pending in Congress.

Second, an application for a grant cannot be approved until the Secretary determines that the treatment works (A) substantially conform with the approved plan or interim plan, (B) are consistent with and carry out the purpose of this act, (C) will be properly and efficiently operated and maintained, (D) are designed to meet foreseeable growth needs of the area, and (E) when located wholly or in part in urbanized areas meet the same conditions with respect to planning and programing that are prescribed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to water and sewer projects under title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

Third, grants under this act cannot be used to assist local or interstate bodies in financing the construction costs of particular waste treatment works within a river basin or basins or portions thereof covered by the completed or interim plan which are actually receiving a Federal grant under the appropriate provisions of such laws as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. This limitation, however, would not prevent the use of the supplemental grant authority in title I of the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966.

Fourth, water-quality standards must be approved by the Secretary and in effect for the area covered by the completed or interim plan.

Fifth, the applicant must adopt prior to receiving a grant a financial program in accordance with the plan.

Subsection (b) contains standard labor provisions.

Section 108

This section provides that once a plan or a portion thereof is approved grants under any other provision of law for treatment works in a river basin or basins or portions thereof covered by such plan cannot be approved unless such works and facilities conform to that plan. If they so conform, the Secretary can, in making grants under section 8(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, waive the dollar limitations in that section for projects in the river basin or basins or parts thereof covered by such plan, as well as under this act.

Section 109

This section authorizes the Secretary to use, to the extent necessary, the authorities contained in section 5(a)(1), (2), (3), and (5) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, in carrying out the provisions of this act. They relate to such activities as research, studies, and the hiring of consultants.

Section 110

This section authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to pay all or part of the expenses of the planning agencies designated by the Secretary under this act to prepare a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan.

Section 111

Subsection (a) requires grant recipients to keep records.

Subsection (b) requires the grant recipient to permit examination of pertinent books, etc., to determine that the funds granted are used as required by the act.

Section 112

This section authorizes an appropriation of \$50 million for fiscal year 1967 to carry out the provisions of this act. It also authorizes additional appropriations for succeeding fiscal years. Funds appropriated are available until expended.

Section 113

This section defines various terms used in the act.

Section 114

This section specifically provides that this act will not affect the jurisdiction of any interstate compact or international body.

TITLE II

Section 201

Subsection (a) provides that it is the purpose of this title to encourage the several States to control pollution on a statewide basis, as well as on a city-by-city basis or a river basin basis. It is also the purpose of the title to encourage the States to establish for all of the waters in the State effective water-quality standards.

Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, now authorizes grants for waste treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters of the Nation. The maximum grant can be 30 percent of the estimated reasonable cost of the project or \$1.2 million, whichever is smaller. When the project serves several communities the dollar maximum is \$4.8 million.

No grant can now be made under section 8 of that act for any project in any State for more than \$250,000 until a grant has been made for each project which requires a grant of less than \$250,000 in that State.

Subsection (a) of this section of title II of the bill authorizes the Secretary to make up to 30 percent grants without regard to the above dollar limitations and the limitation mentioned above regarding projects exceeding \$250,000 in a State, if four conditions precedent are met.

These conditions are: first, the applicant State agency, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency must adopt a financial program that will, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, adequately assure the maintenance of water quality within the metropolitan area within which the applicant is located; second, such applicant must have adequate capability of adopting a sound financial program, including authority to levy water and sewer and sewage treatment charges, to use a metering system, and to raise capital by use of revenue bonds or other methods to assure the future expansion and replacement of such works without subsequent Federal assistance; third, the State must adopt adequate, as determined by the Secretary, statewide water-quality standards, consistent with the criteria established in section 10(c) (3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; and fourth, the State must also match with its own funds the applicant's Federal grant made under this section. The Secretary cannot, however, waive these limitations if a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or interim plan for a river basin within the State has been approved or is in preparation pursuant to the Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966 unless the particular project substantially conforms to such plan.

Section 202

The section authorizes the use of all funds appropriated to the Secretary under section 8(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and allocated to the States pursuant to section 8(c) for the purpose of this title.

Section 203

This section repeats the last sentence of section 8(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. That sentence now waives the dollar limitation mentioned above if a State matches the grants made under section 8(b) of that act from any appropriations exceeding \$100 million made pursuant to section 8(d) of that act and allocated to the States in the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all the States. Thus, the present act authorizes up to \$50 million for a State matching pollution control program. This title will enable the Secretary to use more than \$50 million of the total authorized appropriation of \$150 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the program authorized by this title, if the conditions are met.

TITLE III

Section 301

This section provides a short title.

Section 302

This section provides that it is the purpose of this title to aid and expedite the present Federal, State, and local efforts toward controlling and preventing pollution by providing additional funds to aid the States in formulating, implementing, and enforcing water-quality standards, by increasing the Federal Government's pollution control research efforts, and by strengthening the Secretary's present enforcement authority.

Section 303

This section amends section 7 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Subsection (a) extends the authority in section 7(a) of that act for appropriations to aid the States in establishing and maintaining adequate control measures to prevent and control water pollution to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. This authority will now expire on June 30, 1968.

Subsection (b) adds a new subsection to section 7 which authorizes an annual appropriation of \$5 million for fiscal year 1967 and for 5 subsequent fiscal years to be used by the Secretary, in his discretion, to assist the State and interstate agencies in formulating, implementing, and enforcing water-quality standards pursuant to section 10(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. This amendment will double the present Federal support under the act for State and interstate control agencies.

Section 304

This section amends section 10(c) of the amended. The amendment expands the provisions of that section which relates to the establishment of water-quality standards to include navigable as well as interstate waters. This change makes subsection (c) consistent with the other provisions of section 10 of the act which now apply to both navigable and interstate waters.

Section 305

Subsection (a) amends section 10(d) (1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. That section now directs the Secretary to call a conference (1) when requested by the Governor of a State, or (2) when requested by a State water pollution control agency, or (3) when requested, with the concurrence of the Governor and of the State water pollution control agency, by the governing body of any municipality, or (4) on his own motion if the pollution is affect-

ing persons outside the State where the discharge occurs.

This subsection of the bill amends section 10(d) (1) principally by authorizing the Secretary to call a conference on his own initiative, based on studies conducted pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, if any pollution referred to in section 10(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is, in his judgment, occurring. Thus, the Secretary can act to abate the pollution even if it only affects persons within a single State. He would only act in either case, however, if the pollution was occurring in such quantity to warrant such Federal action.

Subsection (b) amends section 10(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, principally by adding a new provision which is similar to the provision now contained in section 105(c) (1) of the Clean Air Act, as amended.

This provision directs the Secretary to call a conference if he believes that any pollution referred to in section 10(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, which endangers the health or welfare of persons situated in foreign countries, such as Canada and Mexico, is occurring, and if the Secretary of State requests him to call a conference, and if he believes that the pollution is occurring in sufficient quantity to warrant his taking such action. The Secretary will, through the Secretary of State, invite the affected country to participate in the conference.

Section 306

This section amends the second sentence in section 10(e) which now directs the Secretary to delay at least 6 months from the date he recommends remedial action to the State water pollution control agency, after a conference, before he calls a public hearing. This section of the bill eliminates the 6-month waiting period and allows the Secretary to determine what is a reasonable waiting period in each case.

Section 307

This section amends section 10(f) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, which now requires the Secretary to wait at least 6 months after sending the hearing board's findings and recommendations to the persons causing or contributing to the pollution and to the State water pollution control agency, before he acts to abate the pollution. This section of the bill eliminates this built-in delay and leaves it up to the Secretary, depending on the circumstances, to fix a reasonable time for such person or agency to act.

Section 308

This section amends section 10(g) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, which now authorizes the Secretary to request the Attorney General to initiate a suit to abate pollution, which endangers the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge originates and only if the Governor consents in writing. This section of the bill authorizes such a suit without the Governor's consent, if action is not taken within the time given the violator to abate the pollution.

Section 309

This section amends section 10(h) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. Section 10(h) now permits a court in which an action to abate pollution is brought to rehear all of the evidence produced before the Hearing Board and to receive additional evidence and to make new findings de novo. This procedure is time consuming, a burden on the courts, and unnecessary. The Hearing Board convened by the Secretary is composed of persons who are expert and impartial. The courts do not

have the same expertise or the time to develop it adequately. The Board must now hear and consider all relevant evidence to make the necessary findings. The court should not review this evidence de novo and then make either the same or wholly new findings.

This section of the bill requires the court to receive in evidence a transcript of the Board's proceedings and a copy of their findings and recommendations. The court is then bound by the Board's findings if supported by substantial evidence considered on the record as a whole. The court may only receive new evidence discovered after the Board's hearing and before the filing of the suit.

The substantial evidence test is now used in the judicial review of most administrative hearings. It should apply in these cases also.

Section 310

This section adds two new subsections to section 10 of the act.

The first is subsection (k) which enables the Secretary to request the Attorney General to go into court immediately and on his own initiative whenever he believes that actual or threatened pollution deriving from an identifiable source presents an imminent danger to the public health or welfare, or to the Nation's natural resources, or to areas of significant scenic or recreational value, and that there is no other effective means of protection available. This subsection authorizes this action without first exhausting the time-consuming administrative procedures required by the Act.

Some types of pollution can present danger to the health or welfare of the public or to our Nation's natural resources, such as fish and wildlife, and scenic beauty. For example, chemical plants have in the past dumped deadly poisons, such as potassium cyanide into navigable waters. Also, various petroleum products can be a danger to our wildlife populations. When these and other dangerous wastes pollute these waters or threaten to do so, the Secretary needs an adequate tool to cope with this potential disaster. This amendment provides such a tool, but at the same time insures that he cannot exercise this authority lightly in order to avoid the scheme of regulation and procedure expressed in the act.

The second is subsection (l) which provides that findings and recommendations of a Hearing Board convened under section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and court decrees rendered pursuant to this section can be used in private suits to establish prima facie the fact of pollution and the fact that a particular party has caused or contributed to the cause of it.

To establish the fact of pollution in navigable or interstate waters and resultant damage can be very difficult and costly. It usually requires expert witnesses. The Hearing Board and the court have all obtained this evidence on an impartial basis.

There is precedent for this authority. Plaintiffs in private treble damage actions under antitrust laws are permitted to introduce such findings in Government cases. The plaintiff must still prove that he himself has been damaged by the defendant.

Section 311

This section of the bill amends subsection (d) of section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, by deleting paragraph (2) which now limits the amount of funds for research to \$5 million annually. This change will permit the Secretary to conduct research at the dollar level recommended by the President in his message "Preservation of Our Natural Heritage."

Section 312

This section redesignates six sections of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Section 313

This section adds three new sections to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

The first new section is section 11.

Subsection (a) of that section authorizes the Secretary to issue subpoenas compelling attendance of witnesses and the production of various records determined by the Secretary to be relevant at any proceeding held pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. The subpoenas must be served by authorized persons or service must be proved by affidavits of the serving official. Service must be at least 5 days in advance of the date of attendance and must be in the judicial district where the person lives or where such person is doing business.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Secretary to invoke the court's aid when a person fails to respond to a subpoena. Willful failure or refusal to attend and testify, etc., subjects the person to a criminal penalty.

The second new section is section 12.

Subsection (a) of that section authorizes the Secretary, in order that he may abate the pollution of interstate or navigable waters which endangers the health or welfare of any person, to enter and inspect public and private facilities from which any discharge of matter emanates causing or contributing to the pollution, directly or indirectly, of such waters or their tributaries.

Subsection (b) provides a penalty for refusing to permit an inspection.

Subsection (c) defines the term "matter." The third new section is section 13.

This section directs the Secretary to require by regulation that public or private facilities discharging matter into interstate or navigable waters must register such discharges with the Secretary, including the point, amount, and nature of the discharge. Changes in the nature, quantity, or location of the discharged matter must also be reported, as well as such other information as the Secretary may require to carry out adequately the purpose of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Subsection (b) requires that fees be established by regulation which, in the aggregate will pay for the costs of handling the notices required by this new section.

Subsection (c) provides for a civil penalty of \$200 a day for failure to file the notices required by this new section. The penalty begins after the expiration of 30 days after the Secretary notifies the person of his failure to file. The penalty is recoverable in a civil suit, but may be remitted or mitigated by the Secretary, if based on the circumstances of each case, he believes that such action is warranted and in furtherance of the purpose of the act.

Subsection (d) defines the term "matter."

TITLE IV

Section 401

This section amends title 28 of the United States Code by adding a new section 1362. This new section gives to the district courts of the United States original jurisdiction in private actions brought to enjoin pollution of interstate or navigable waters. Such persons are now permitted to bring actions to enjoin nuisances which adversely affect the use and enjoyment of their property. In the normal case, absent diversity of citizenship, such persons must sue in State courts. Even when diversity exists, the amount in controversy must be more than \$10,000. Nuisance resulting from the pollution of interstate or navigable waters should be subject

to injunctive relief in Federal courts without regard to the issue of diversity or the amount in controversy. This new section will further the objective of this legislation which is to abate pollution for the benefit of all.

Section 402

This section amends section 13 of the Refuse Act by requiring a determination by the Secretary of the Interior that the depositing of refuse matter into navigable waters is consistent with the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. The Corps of Engineers must still determine if the refuse will be harmful to anchorage and navigation.

Section 403

This section amends the Oil Pollution Act. This section transfers the authority to administer the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, to the Secretary of the Interior from the Secretary of the Army.

DISCRIMINATORY RAIL TAXATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and for Senators PASTORE, COTTON, BARTLETT, HARTKE, HART, BREWSTER, NEUBERGER, MORTON, SCOTT, and PROUTY for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to eliminate discriminatory tax assessments of railroad property. This bill has both a substantive and procedural aspect. First, it would amend the Interstate Commerce Act to declare unlawful, as an unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and an undue burden upon interstate commerce, the assessment of property of any common carrier which bears a higher ratio to its true market value than the assessed value of other property in the taxing district subject to the same property tax levy. Secondly, it would provide a remedy in the Federal courts for such carriers against the collection of any tax based on such unlawful assessment.

These discriminatory taxes force the railroad industry to annually pay over a hundred million dollars more ad valorem property taxes than if railroad assessments had been made at the same percent of value as were the assessments of other property owners.

The burden of proving that tax assessments in any State are not fairly and reasonably equalized remains on the railroad seeking relief. In the majority of States that do not discriminate, State property tax assessments would in no way be affected by this bill. In the remaining States, unless and until an affected railroad can prove that it is being unfairly discriminated against in property tax assessments, there would be no change required under this measure.

The special study group on transportation policy of the Committee on Commerce in its 1961 report found that despite State laws requiring uniform tax treatment, railroads are discriminated against as compared to other property taxpayers in the same jurisdiction due in large measure to outdated procedures for assessment of property. The Association of American Railroads supplied to the study group an analysis based on the 1957 Census of Governments, conducted by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, showing that for

the year 1957 discriminatory taxes exceeded \$141 million.

The study group recommended that either Federal law exempt railroad right-of-way property from States taxation, or that the antidiscrimination tax bill which I am today introducing be enacted. The study group had this to say about an antidiscrimination tax bill:

Passage by the Congress of such a bill would not change the substantive effect of the tax laws of the several States because, without known exception, all States, either by constitutional safeguard or legislative provision declare it to be State law that taxpayers within its jurisdiction should be taxed uniformly. The addition of a procedural remedy, by authorizing Federal courts to enjoin collection of discriminatory taxes against interstate carriers, is consistent with the obligation of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, required under the Federal Constitution and is thereby a proper and necessary action of the Congress.

I was reluctant in 1961 to urge action by the Congress because I believed that the States should be given every opportunity to correct their outdated procedures which result in discriminatory rail taxation. Over 5 years have now elapsed since the study group report was transmitted to the Committee on Commerce. Unfortunately, the passage of time has indicated that the States either cannot or will not take action to end this discriminatory taxation. The impact on essential passenger services of State tax practices was highlighted at the Commerce Committee hearings last March on a number of bills to provide aid to passenger railroads throughout the Nation which were primarily motivated by the plight of the New Haven passenger service.

Last fall I supported the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act to provide Federal assistance, cooperative demonstrations, and research and development projects in high-speed transportation. This legislation will enable us to find ways to transport people faster, and with greater comfort and safety. As the President said in signing that act on September 30, 1965, the time has come to do something about improving the speed and the convenience of ground transportation.

Discriminatory taxation could nullify our efforts to achieve better and faster and more economical ground transportation. Since this problem was forcefully called to the attention of the Committee on Commerce 5 years ago by its special study group it is estimated that over one-half billion dollars in discriminatory taxes have been assessed against the railroad industry.

This amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act to end discriminatory rail taxation, which I am today introducing, will remove a barrier to Federal, State, and industry efforts to provide modern ground transportation without altering the freedom of a State to tax its taxpayers so long as interstate carriers are accorded equal tax treatment with other taxpayers.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2988) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communication common carriers. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with an explanation of the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2989) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communication common carriers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanation, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 89th Congress a proposal to amend the Communications Act to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communications common carriers.

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The attached proposal is a revision of a Commission proposal submitted in the 88th Congress and introduced in the Senate as S. 2624.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Yours sincerely,

E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TITLE II OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, TO GIVE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION REGULATORY AUTHORITY OVER THE PROVISION OF COMMUNICATION FACILITIES BETWEEN COMMUNICATION COMMON CARRIERS

The proposed legislation would eliminate from the Communications Act a hiatus which exists in the statutory scheme for the regulation of communication carriers by the Commission. The Commission, under the provisions of title II of that act, is given full authority to regulate all charges, practices, classifications and regulations for and in connection with interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio furnished the public by communication carriers. The statute also authorizes the Commission to require communication carriers to establish physical connection with other carriers and to establish through routes and charges applicable thereto and the division of such charges and to require such carriers to establish and provide facilities and regulations for operating such through routes. No provision, however, is contained in the act granting the Commission authority to modify or prescribe the terms and conditions under which facilities are or may be provided by one common carrier to another for the rendition of interstate or foreign communication service to the public. Similarly, the Commission is without authority to require one carrier to provide such facilities to another if they are unable to agree regarding the provision of such facilities.

In the communications common carrier industry, it has been a common practice for one carrier to furnish facilities to another carrier for use by the latter in furnishing its services to the public. The practice has been most widespread in the domestic field. Thus, for example in 1964, the Western Union Telegraph Co. paid to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. a total of \$15 million for the rental of various kinds of communication facilities. In fact, more than 56 percent of Western Union's intercity telegraph circuitry (3.9 million out of a total of 7.1 million circuit miles) was derived in 1964 by Western Union from facilities supplied by other carriers.

In the international field, the international telegraph carriers have been almost entirely dependent upon the transoceanic cables of A.T. & T. for the cable circuits they require to meet expanding demands for their services. These facilities have been obtained under a variety of arrangements consisting of the rental or lease of one or more cable channels or by obtaining an indefeasible right of user to a given number of such channels in those cables.

On several occasions, carriers have complained to the Commission concerning the reasonableness of the terms and conditions under which they have obtained their facilities from another carrier. These complaints have been directed to the charges made by the lesser carrier or restrictions and restraints placed by the lesser carrier upon the use that may be made of the facilities by the lessee carrier. There has also been some independent awareness by the Commission of apparent inequities or improprieties in such arrangements. But notwithstanding such complaints or the Commission's independent awareness, absent complaints, the Commission has been unable to take corrective action with respect to the matter inasmuch as it is the Commission's view that it lacks clear statutory authority to regulate the charges and other terms and conditions governing the arrangements between common carriers regarding the provision of such facilities.

If charges made by the lesser carrier are unreasonably high, the result can be the

imposition of burdensome charges on the users of the services of the lessee carrier. Excessive charges may also effectively prevent the lessee carrier from competing with the lessor carrier in the communications market. Moreover, if the lessor carrier imposes conditions that unreasonably restrict the use of the facilities by the lessee carrier, it can thereby prevent the lessee carrier from offering needed services to the public. Or, a lessor carrier may discriminate among carriers by refusing to lease facilities to one carrier at charges or under conditions as favorable as those under which it leases facilities to another carrier or to the public. It is the view of the Commission that such practices could have a serious and detrimental effect on both charges and services to the public, as well as on competition within the communications industry. Although it might be possible to control some of the practices within the framework of the anti-trust laws, it seems clear that legislation is necessary to provide a more expeditious and efficient remedy by conferring direct regulatory authority on the Commission over such matters.

Thus, the proposed legislation would require a carrier to file with the Commission copies of all contracts or other arrangements with other carriers regarding the furnishing of facilities to be used to render communication service to the public. Such legislation would empower the Commission, upon complaint or upon its own motion and after full opportunity for hearing and the making of the required findings, to modify or prescribe the charges or other terms and conditions governing the furnishing of facilities pursuant to such arrangements.

To insure that this new statutory authority would fully protect the public interest, the Commission also believes that it should be able, in appropriate circumstances and upon petition by a carrier, to order one carrier to provide facilities to such other carrier. Otherwise, even if the Commission were able to regulate the charges and terms and conditions applicable to the provision of facilities among carriers, it would still be powerless to require carriers in the first instance to furnish facilities to another carrier or to require a carrier to continue to furnish facilities to another carrier although it may be in the public interest to do so. Absence of such authority might result in costly duplication of facilities by two common carriers, with a resultant adverse effect on the public. Under the new regulatory authority proposed, therefore, the Commission would be empowered, upon petition and after a full opportunity for hearing, to order one common carrier to provide facilities for interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio to one or more other carriers if the Commission finds (1) that such action is in the public interest; (2) that the carriers have been unable to agree with respect to the provision of such facilities; (3) that the provision of such facilities will not impair the ability of the supplying carrier to perform its duty to the public; and (4) that such facilities are reasonably available without the construction of new facilities.

The authority sought in the proposed legislation is not entirely new or novel. The Commission has been given much more extensive regulatory authority over arrangements between the Communications Satellite Corporation and other communication carriers by section 401 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 741). This section also provides that the furnishing of satellite terminal station facilities by one communication carrier to another is deemed to be a common carrier activity fully subject to the Communications Act. In explaining why such provision was added to that act, the report of the Senate Committee on Commerce stated:

"The reason for this amendment is because the provision of facilities by one common carrier to another common carrier has not been regarded as a common carrier undertaking." (Sen. Rept. No. 1584, 87th Cong., 2d sess.)

Other Federal regulatory agencies have been given jurisdiction, in varying degrees, with respect to the furnishing by one public utility of services or facilities to another utility for the rendition of service to the public.

The Federal Power Act, subchapter II (16 U.S.C. 824, 824a-824h), grants authority to the Federal Power Commission to regulate the transmission and sale of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce by one utility to another for resale. Such authority includes the power to fix just and reasonable rates for the sale of such electric energy and to order the furnishing of adequate service, "Provided, That the Commission shall not have authority to compel the public utility to sell or exchange energy when to do so would impair its ability to render adequate service to its customers." The Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717, 717a-717w) grants similar authority to the Federal Power Commission with respect to transporting and selling natural gas by one utility to another for resale. The standards and criteria utilized in connection with the delegation of the above-described functions to the Federal Power Commission are substantially similar to those set forth in title II of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 201-222).

The charges for services rendered "airfreight forwarders" by air carriers which are directly engaged in the operation of aircraft in air transportation are subject to regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board by virtue of the same sections of the Federal Aviation Act that confer jurisdiction on the CAB to regulate the charges of such air carriers for services rendered to the public (49 U.S.C. 1374, 1482). "Airfreight forwarders" are classified as indirect air carriers by the Civil Aeronautics Board (14 CFR 296.2(a), 297.2). See also section 101(3) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1301(3)).

The Civil Aeronautics Board also is required either to approve or to disapprove of every contract affecting air transportation between an air carrier and any other air carrier, foreign air carrier, and certain other carriers regarding such things as pooling earnings or equipment, establishment of fares, improving safety and efficiency of operation, regulating wasteful competition, regulating schedules or other cooperative working arrangements (49 U.S.C. 1382).

A freight forwarder is defined in part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act as a common carrier. (49 U.S.C. 1002(5)). The Interstate Commerce Commission has authority to fix just and reasonable rates for such transportation by railroad (49 U.S.C. 1(5), 2, 3(1), 13, 15), by motor vehicle (49 U.S.C. 316), and by water carrier (49 U.S.C. 905, 907), including the transportation of property for freight forwarders (see also 49 U.S.C. 1007, 1008, 1009). The ICC also has authority to order a railroad to provide safe and adequate facilities for performing as a common carrier its car service and to extend its line or lines if it finds, among other things, that the expense involved will not impair the ability of the carrier to perform its duty to the public (49 U.S.C. 1(21)).

The ICC also is authorized by section 3(5) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 3(5)) to require the use of the terminal facilities of one railroad by another and to fix the terms and compensation therefor in event the carriers cannot agree.

In summary, the Commission believes that this additional regulatory authority is needed in order more effectively to carry out its statutory duties in the public interest, and, specifically, to remedy those situations where, because of a statutory gap, it is severely

handicapped in efforts to assure that the public is provided with the most economical and efficient communication service.

Adopted: May 12, 1965.

AMENDMENT TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2991) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under the present act, Federal assistance for public works and development facilities is available to, among others, counties or municipalities with a population of over 250,000. The amendment which I propose would extend eligibility to "compact and contiguous areas containing a population of over 150,000." My intention is to include within the confines of the act contiguous areas within large metropolitan areas which do not presently qualify only because they are not separate political entities. My amendment would not allow smaller areas of population to be brought into the act. The contiguous areas in the proposed amendment must be at least as large as the presently defined municipality of 250,000.

This act seeks to bring help to disadvantaged areas through expanding public works which will create, directly or indirectly, new opportunities for long-term employment and economic growth. Certainly, the criteria for such assistance should not depend on the fact that an area is "a municipality" but rather assistance should flow to those areas where the greatest benefits may accrue. Areas such as New York's Bedford-Stuyvesant and Harlem, St. Louis' Kinlock area, the East Side of Detroit, and the Watts area of Los Angeles deserve the opportunity to apply for Federal assistance under this program. Under the present law, these areas which need it so badly and are clearly defined areas with a character of their own—though part of a metropolitan area—have no access to assistance because the cities of which they are a part do not qualify.

I hope this important amendment will receive the prompt attention of the Senate.

THE RIGHT OF EACH STATE TO DECIDE QUESTIONS OF DECENCY AND MORALITY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution relating to the right of a State to enact legislation on the basis of its own public policy on questions of decency and morality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 140) proposing to amend the Constitution relating to the right of a State to enact legislation on the basis of its own public policy on questions of decency and morality, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am introducing a constitutional amendment vesting in each of the respective States the authority to effectively deal with this deluge of obscene and pornographic publications which have now reached epidemic proportions throughout this country and presently constitutes a serious national problem. This amendment states as follows:

The right of each State to decide on the basis of its own public policy questions of decency and morality, and to enact legislation with respect thereto, shall not be abridged.

My staff is also presently drafting legislation to give Federal postal authorities the means by which to exclude obscene materials from the U.S. mails. These bills will be drafted in final form after we have had an opportunity to study the decisions related to this subject which are expected to be handed down by the Supreme Court within the next several weeks.

Mr. President, it was the Senate Judiciary Committee which first exposed the American public to the shocking extent and nature of this multibillion-dollar smut industry in 1955 through its hearings held pursuant to Senate Resolution 62 of the 84th Congress. In 1957, as the result of the Roth decision, which I shall discuss more fully, it was generally believed that the Court had enunciated a decision by which obscenity could be effectively eradicated by State and Federal authorities, within the bounds of constitutional guarantees. However, subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court have given smut peddlers a free rein and have placed our State and Federal prosecutors in a legal straitjacket. The present situation has become so serious, Mr. President, that it virtually cries out for legislative relief.

There is a growing ground swell of anger, anxiety, and public outrage among the American people at the mounting deluge of literary and photographic filth being brazenly displayed in public places and distributed through the U.S. mails. Americans everywhere have grown sick and tired of having themselves and their families subjected to the perverted presence and the corrupting infectious influence of this moral and social disease which has now reached epidemic proportions. The Post Office Department alone records that the number of American citizens officially complaining about the receipt of this unsolicited, salacious literature has now increased 200 percent since 1957, to a 1965 high of 128,000.

Law enforcement and citizens' organizations concerned with this problem estimate that the smut peddlers now

gross around \$3 billion per year, with California alone now having 20 to 30 corporations engaged in publishing pornographic material on a multimillion-dollar annual basis.

The seriousness of the situation is summed up in the January 1966 publication of the *Knights of Columbus*, in an article entitled "Pornography Becomes Brazen," wherein it states:

This current social contagion of pornography is comparable in many respects to the rat-borne bubonic plague of the Middle Ages. Pornography has become the new American plague.

No undercover police investigation is needed to verify this. It's in the open.

The same cry of alarm has been echoed throughout the Nation in countless editorials and articles dealing with this acute problem.

Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, president of the 9 million member General Federation of Women's Clubs, raised the cry for legislative action in this area in the November 1964 issue of that organization's national magazine, the *Club Woman*:

In recent months I have received a large amount of mail from clubwomen in all sections of the country protesting the emphasis on salaciousness which has gained such newstand prominence. Consider this: surveys reveal that young people comprise a major part of the readership of these magazines. The results are matters of court records * * * sex crimes, shocking rises in social disease in teenagers. The total result is a lowering of our moral standards, the lives of young people blighted in their teens. It is due time that we clubwomen rise up and attack the problem, beginning with our individual communities * * *. Flagrant disregard of public opinion and public welfare cannot continue indefinitely. There is, inevitably, a day of reckoning. I hope this day now has arrived.

Mrs. Hasebroock and the General Federation of Women's Clubs are to be commended for their public stand on this crisis in national morality. I likewise hope that the day of reckoning has arrived and that this Congress will promptly and effectively meet its responsibilities in this area.

Mr. President, the most serious and shocking aspect of this entire national problem lies in the fact that approximately 75 percent of this commercialized obscenity is estimated to be directed at the young, immature, and impressionable minds of our teenage population. It is an undisputed fact that the smut peddling industry goes to great effort and expense to obtain mailing lists of young Americans who subsequently become the recipients of unsolicited filth through the U.S. mails, as stated by an article in the *National Catholic Ecumenical Weekly*:

More shocking, though, is the fact that thousands of youngsters, even of grade school age, receive this smut through the mail when they innocently place orders for stamps or other hobby items. Once their name is on a mailing list, brokers often lease the list to filth merchants who use it indiscriminately. Despite hundreds of angry letters from parents, postal authorities have been unable to close this major source of smut by mail.

Recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court have virtually nullified our stat-

utes regulating the traffic of immoral material through the Federal mails and have rendered our postal authorities helpless to prevent this shocking situation. The time for congressional action to remedy this situation is long overdue.

Responsible journalists throughout our country are taking notice of the danger which this problem poses to our Nation's youth. As stated in a January 8, 1966, editorial appearing in the *Shreveport Journal*:

Publishers of filth, just as do the narcotics rackets, make a strong appeal to children. Their aim, of course, is to create lifelong customers regardless of what effects obscene pictures and reading matter may have on impressionable young minds.

Dr. E. Preston Sharp, executive director of the Philadelphia, Pa., Youth Center, Dr. Donald G. Cortum, national co-chairman of Citizens for Decent Literature, and Dr. George Henry of the Cornell College of Medicine, are only a few of the medical experts who have testified as to the dangerous "effects obscene pictures and reading matter may have on the impressionable young mind."

The potential danger which this problem poses to our society is not necessarily limited to the degrading and corrupting influence it may have on those directly affected, for the presence of obscene literature will often provide the trigger by which the latent potential of an unbalanced mind may be transformed into an overt criminal act which is frequently violent in nature. As was ably stated in an editorial appearing in the February 6, 1965, edition of the *Wabash, Ind., Plain Dealer*:

More than mere morality is involved in this fight against literary filth. Psychiatrists tell us that many seemingly normal persons are actually borderline psychotics. In effect, such persons are human bombs who can be frightfully detonated by the stimulus of vivid pornographic pictures or words.

When it happens, women and children are usually their tragic victims.

The relationship between pornography and violent crime has long been recognized by such eminent law enforcement officials as J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

As stated by Mr. Henry E. Sheridan of the Massachusetts Citizens for Decent Literature:

The assertion of recognized authorities should not go unnoticed as we survey this dismal picture, that there is a very definite link between many crimes of sex violence and smut literature.

Yes, Mr. President, it is an outrageous disgrace that these peddlers of perverted pornography can traffic in their tarnished trade in trash with insolent impunity from successful prosecution by State or Federal authorities, behind the protective cloak of a Supreme Court, the majority of which seemingly cannot comprehend the distinction between liberty and license. Their distorted misconstructions of the constitutional guarantee set forth in the first amendment have virtually nullified our State and Federal regulatory statutes and have bound our prosecuting attorneys in a legal straitjacket. Certainly their recent decisions

call to mind the accusation of John Milton, wherein he charged:

License they mean when they cry liberty.

As summed up by one religious periodical:

With billions of dollars at stake, smut merchants naturally fight any legal strictures on their business, hiding behind the first amendment, which guarantees freedom of the press. Unfortunately, many well-meaning jurists, organizations, and individuals who tend to confuse liberty and license, join these publishers in their cynical misuse of the Constitution.

In the 1957 case of *Roth v. United States*, 354 U.S. 476, the Supreme Court upheld convictions under State and Federal statutes dealing with the regulation of obscene publications. In a comprehensive decision, the Court set forth what many hoped to be an effective test for obscene material. As stated by the Court:

Obscene material is material which deals with sex in a manner appealing to prurient interests.

The test to be applied was "whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest."

However, the hopes of those who found encouragement in the Roth decision were soon dispelled.

In 1962 the Court, in the case of *Manual Enterprises v. Day*, 370 U.S. 478, held that in addition to the "prurient interest" standard set forth in the Roth decision, the material must be "patently offensive" to fall without the protective shield of the first amendment. According to Harlan, this means only "hard-core" pornography can "constitutionally be reached under this or similar State obscenity statutes."

The shocking impact of the Court's decision in the *Manual Enterprises* case cannot be fully realized without taking notice of the vile and obscene nature of the material involved therein. The Court's approval of such salacious trash which by its own admission consisted of publications "primarily, if not exclusively, for homosexuals, and have no literary, scientific or other merit" and which "would appeal to the prurient interest of such sexual deviates," is an outrageous and reprehensible perversion of the spirit as well as the letter of the first amendment. As stated in Justice Clark's dissenting opinion, the decision, "despite the clear congressional mandate—requires the post office to be the world's largest disseminator of smut and the grand informer of the names and places where obscene material may be obtained."

The indignation of the American people at these decisions was vividly described by Rev. John J. Regan, dean of St. Joseph's University of Liberal Arts and Sciences:

We have come to expect periodic outbursts from the American public at the Supreme Court's decisions dealing with obscenity. The people are rightly concerned. Our society is in the middle of an anti-Puritan revolution in morals. Any writer who man-

ages to shock is automatically entitled to respect as a worthy rebel. William Phillips, editor of the *Partisan Review*, has labeled the heroes of today's avant-garde as "the new immoralists." He adds: "To embrace what is assumed to be beyond the pale is taken as a sign of true sophistication. And this is not simply a change in sensibility; it amounts to sensibility of chaos."

In reaction to this revolution, the ordinary citizen is developing a neurosis about courts and judges. He sees the flood of pornography inundating the newsstand and the local movie theater, and flowing steadily into the private home through the mails. In desperation he is turning to the legislatures and ultimately to the courts for protection. But he is frustrated by the apparent lack of concern in the courts for his problem. He sees little of the delicate judicial task of balancing the public interest in the moral fabric of society with the equally important public interest in free speech.

How long must the people of America be subjected to the outrage of having their families and children subjected to the public presence of this shocking, salacious, obscene literature?

How long must the public suffer the contemptuous, arrogant disregard for their rights exhibited by a court which seems obsessed with its role as the protective guardian of those who seek to subvert every institution, idea, principle, and moral value which our people hold dear and upon which this great Nation has been established?

We have taken progressive and effective steps to purge the pollution from our streams and air; to beautify our public highways and national parks; to protect the physical and mental health of our families.

When will be taken the necessary steps to purge the venomous stain of this malignant, infectious, pornographic plague from the midst of our society?

I submit that this responsibility rests with the Congress and that the time to act is now.

PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 489

Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. GRUENING) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2933) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes, which was received, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT COMMITTEE TO FILE ITS REPORT ON MARCH 17, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Economic Committee be granted an extension from March 1, 1966, to March 17, 1966, to file a report of its findings and recommendations with respect to the economic report which is required by section 5(b)(3) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress.

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

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK FOR CO-SPONSORS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the bill (S. 2947) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act, is at the desk for the benefit of Senators who may wish to cosponsor it.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk until this coming Friday, March 4, 1966.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] be added as a cosponsor of the bill, S. 2888, to insure that children participating in domestic nonprofit school lunch programs will be assured of adequate supplies of nutritious dairy products.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators CANNON and SCOTT be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2916) to provide for a weather modification program to be carried out by the Secretary of Commerce.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 85, a resolution introduced by Senator McCARTHY, providing that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill and resolution:

Authority of February 16, 1966:

S. 2928. A bill to amend title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to authorize the Commissioner of Education to provide technical assistance and grants to school boards in support of programs designed to overcome any racial imbalance in the public schools: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

Authority of February 21, 1966:

S. Res. 227. Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Small Business Administration should remain an independent agency of the United States: Mr. DOMINICK.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATIONS OF ANDREW F. BRIMMER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, AND WILLIAM W. SHERRILL, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on the nominations of Andrew F. Brimmer, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and William W. Sherrill, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The hearing is scheduled to be held on Wednesday, March 2, 1966, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, at 10:30 a.m.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with these nominations are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225-3921.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 28, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 577. An act for the relief of Mary F. Morse;

S. 851. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan; and

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable constructions costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain Indian lands.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 251) to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

SENTIMENT ABOUT VIETNAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, often news is made by dissenters and critics.

Even though people in agreement often represent an overwhelming majority, content often appears less appealing than discontent.

Last week, at the University of Missouri in Columbia, it was announced that 50 persons were expected to take part in protesting our policies in Vietnam. I

am told, however, that not more than 10 actually participated at any one time.

Very properly this news was reported and made headlines. Most of these same stories, however, failed to mention the fact, that shortly before the demonstrations, a great many more students at the university, specifically, 1,125, had signed petitions affirming their support of the policies of this administration in Vietnam.

Those petitions were circulated by both the Young Democratic and the Young Republican Clubs at the university.

I ask unanimous consent that the wording of the petition be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the names of all those who signed be printed at the point in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM PETITION

Whereas the American commitment in the Vietnam war has become a major issue on many college campuses;

Whereas some of the most striking dissenters to American policy in Vietnam have been college students; and

Whereas these critics seem unrepresentative of the majority of the students at the University of Missouri at Columbia: Therefore

We the undersigned students of the University of Missouri at Columbia, after consideration of the critical complexities of this issue, affirm our support of President Lyndon B. Johnson and his administration's policy in Vietnam.

SIGNERS

Kenneth G. Matthews, Dave Salisbury, William C. Tuen, Ronald Fuber, Paul Field, Ron Moody, Gary Shipper, Ralph Borsum, Kenneth McGee, Mike Burnham, Tom Young, Bob West, Stephen Struffer, Douglas C. Hager, Larry C. Copeland, Bill Dabney, Robert E. Kindler, Dale Mayness, Mike Martin, James T. McGregor, Michael D. Martin, James Russell Goff, Richard H. Kessinger, James H. Jarman, Michael Drury, Joseph W. Kubengoski, Wm. Franklin, Paul Sherrill, Glen Rutz, Dennis Hale, Tom Osborn, Jr., Patrick Zorsch, Thomas Hill, Jeff Hascovits, Edward W. Bass, Carl Ledbetter, Robin Watson, Bruce D. Findley, J. Randall Broyles, James D. Jones, David L. Duke, Roger Wehlie, Greg Haase, Steve Sheppard, Don Lueckenotte, Gregory Luetkemeyer, Wm. F. Erling, Arthur Ellis, Claude Eldridge, Larry W. Zimmer.

Ronald Mann, Deanna Dean, Nancy A. Leaf, Michael R. Ewing, Gary Findlay, John Blance, Bob Parker, Larry Moore, Cindy Palmer, Harry Hill, Nancy Morgenstern, Noelle Schattyn, Marge Agatstein, Danny F. Moody, Rita Young, Judy White, Ricky Mongler, Tom Miskell, Thomas Jennings, Jeffrey D. England, Von Armstrong, Ralph Schoeder, Mike Macy, John Ford, Kay Cissna.

M. Walsh, Steven Overy, Edna Overy, John Montgomery, Eldon E. Hallen, Carl H. Graham, Steven Huitt, Andrew S. Kalmus, Clark A. Gurn, Mel Gerstner, Albert Ward, Jack Bard, Dennis E. Stevens, Tom R. Talbert, Michael E. Ming, A. Marion Houghton Jr., Ray Seward, Alan B. Holbrook, Robert T. Roth, Wilma Thompson, Garry S. Hirsch, John K. Zigler, George S. Kishmer, Russell L. Cooper, Kathy Grossarth.

Mike Smith, Michael Watkins, Ellen M. Kane, Dianne A. Taus, C. T. South, Anne T. Clark, Liz Manson, Alice A. Templeton, Robert F. Striken, Thomas S. Patten, Jennie Myers, Judith E. Turner, David W. Gardner, Ellen Sue Zigel, Frances E. Wilson, Mary J.

Hagan, Carolyn M. Kaiser, Michael L. Villain, Richard Fredman, James V. Schwent, Thomas Lee Siffin, Paul Andrews, Toni Rewick, Loran, Maloney, William Gordon Culver.

Sharon Sue Patterson, Lindy Perner, Jacque Finney, William L. Smith, Jeffrey Murphy, June Throckmorton, David Murphy, Jr., Herbert R. Finch, James G. Freer, John Micholench, Ronald N. Bold, John D. Cuneo, Wesley H. Sizemore, Jr., Noel Lane Flippen, Matthew Knuckles, John Struwe, Charlie Dodds, Ray Raleigh, Randy P. Scott, Janice Taylor, M. V. Weertz, Bettie Marie Bommarito, Dominic Lee, Joseph Patten, Clarke Atteberry.

Larry E. Huffman, Robert Heek, Clarence R. Geud, George M. Cox, C. Hunt Bushnell, Jr., Beverly Jones, Lesere Dollar, Kurt A. Leonard, Robert Botkin, David M. Etdle, Joe Smith, Donald George, Lawrence D. Whetley, Jacquelyn Steers, John R. Harris, Michael Pera, John Wyman Ewing, C. Eugene Thompson, Barb Rostenberg, Don Walter, Jim Willsey, Mike Lee, Andy Benage, Jim Alzbaugh, Jim Westcott.

William Gerry Brumfield, Thomas B. Allen, Donald C. Gerhardt, Kenneth R. Ray, James Edward Turner, Robert Eugene Heater, John M. Gianino, David Radunsky, Edward M. Wheat, Ronald N. Lingo, Mike Walters, Tom Haynes, Roger S. Mixtar, Mike Gibbons, Irving W. Kurtz, Lawrence R. Lemer, Mike Kuppel, Derrell Andrews, Robert Lee Hill, Edwin W. Joem, Gary Stitt, Stephen J. Levitch, Neal D. Warren, Roy G. Cappell, Robert T. Eppelson.

Darlene Bagert, John Koehler, Stephen Deurhtsky, Larry Fenton, Barbara Verespey, Linda Taylor, Lawrence Q. Ramey, Michael W. Risk, Randy Herzog, Michael Schroeder, Richard Boatman, Donald Whitney, James C. Bellis, Roger Cooley, John Marshal Gorchin, Paul C. Shirley, Jr., Dennis Long, Roger C. Combs, Fred K. Atkinson, John W. Laugh, Jr., Gerald Lee Wesselmann, Thomas A. Pallen, Diana Wegman, Arnie McNett, Duane Randall.

Phil Taylor, Thomas E. Lawson, William Fisher, Nancy Wendel, Mike Browning, John Bayner, Gary Lynn Lentz, Jim Powell, Terry Liles, David G. Harbison, Gary A. Duncan, Stephen F. Pickering, Jon Stanley, Carolyn Swallow, Steven Finkel, Brandt Croke, Norman Ryan, Heide Hallgagend, S. D. Caulder, Walter B. Panko, Paul H. Lettmann, Kathy E. Pontires, David P. DeWalls, Louis Schumaker.

Danny Paul Barrett, Arthur R. Kabey, David L. Toppen, Lawrence C. Rhyne, Suzie Parker, Paul Holt, Jack Belt, Albert Spinning, Tom Newly, C. P. Baggero, F. H. Repke, Mrs. Judith O. Repke, Mrs. Alfred Novak, Roy E. Baker, Jr., Georgia I. Caldwell, Edward S. Grigg, P. J. Loesch, Jr., Charles E. Meyers, Sr., Robert E. Peltz, James D. Calhoun, Lyndia H. Porterfield, James Van Hoesen, Patricia M. Jordan, James L. Dole, Perry W. Schaefer.

Lee Woodward, Mike Kupen, William T. Todd, Mike Cravens, Lawrence A. Schwartz, Evelyn Mooney, Joseph W. Weyerich, Philip M. Porter, John L. White, Donald J. Slifer, Leo G. Yoder, Robert C. Allen, Richard Pipes, Larry Hampton, Charles O. Mileaye, Gary Wilcox, Timothy Guse, Sidney Wen-graver, Janice P. Wilmsmeyer, Ralph I. Gates, Tom S. Woods, Mrs. Diane G. Ghun, Steve Rose, Sharon Riley, Robert C. Holmes.

Luke W. Jenkins, Donald L. Packwood, Martin J. Megeff, Walter Browder, Kenneth D. Martin, Judith Eckley, Earl Eckley, Andrew B. Bable, Gerry J. Grecco, Arle B. Chever, Don Goodman, Jesse Miller, Phil Heath, K. Wendell Gore, Donald Jay Hanson, Gary C. Hengus, Larry Burdett, Ronnie Goldsmith, Douglas F. Divvers, Lip V. Lumar, Tommy King, Phyllis Christian, Sue Mitschele.

Roger Eugene Thaller, Darrell L. Kearns, Thomas R. Williams, David L. Sammerich,

Joan Gentry, Frank Alfieri, Roy W. Mefford, Lee Copeland, W. A. Bryant, Dennis F. Tolahim, Stuart Smith, S. J. Dolson, Richard Eickelberger, Gary Thomas, Randy Russell, James Thomas Galut, Gary Lynn Sanders, Sue Shulanbarger, Jeannie Muench, George Mumford, Kathy Spohn, Larry M. Dyer, Adrian S. Juttner, John S. Haley, Robert F. Spruitz, Jr.

Stanley Ringusen, Jerry Schurenberg, R. F. Hawk, James D. Burch, Paul J. Nangle, Walter Klein, Bill Whitmer, Everett Sapp, C. Fred Thompson, William R. Manle, Richard Lans Spencer, Carol Fisher, Richard L. Swallow, William C. Sutton, R. M. Marshall, Larry N. Woods, John W. Boise, Carol Bowman, Tom Strongman, Richard E. White, Thomas M. Downs, Kenneth Harpster, Larry R. Hanning, Tom Butterworth, Dale Ridder.

Anne Marie Weiss, Kathleen Burton, Linda Braver, James N. Finnell, Lloyd H. Crews, Jr., Howard C. Wright, Jr., Joe Bauman, Patrick R. Baldwin, H. L. Calm, Joseph A. Sarsen, Katie Love, Wally Williamson, Wayne Brady, H. Lawrence Hottelman, John A. Dearing, Jr., Tom Ballard, Neal Dowers, Michael L. Coney, Terry Green, L. W. Hosemon, Ginny White, Charles Stecher, Gary T. Christoff, John C. Taylor, Ronald G. Fenkel.

Don Boullear, Jack Garrison, W. P. Kane, E. A. Cabot, Janet Maerz, John Arnold, Jim Bowers, John Crestman, Sandra Bunch, Thomas B. Darnell II, Arthur Lee Gully, Mary Hartman, Ken Teepe, Janet Sawyers, Linda Miller, William M. Morton, Mike Wright, O. Keith Backhaus, Frank H. Knight, Thomas P. O'Donnell, Janine Boals, Richard Benks, Cheryl Smith, Ron Beck, Robert S. Davidson.

Dennis Sook, Richard King, Valerie Abeln, Ronald Price, Tom Rafines, David Fallmer, Greg McPike, John Pollard, Doug Wankel, David R. Davis II, Walter F. Love, Beverly J. Leach, Donald J. Saldway, Michael Chilsign, Jr., Margaret McGray, Michael Weber, Marlis McWilliams, Elmer F. Finke, Jr., Lauren Glauser, Richard Ritz, Charles Hanor, King D. Douglas, Terry R. Cantor, Len M. Beisn, Harriet C. Wadsworth.

A. K. Nelson, Linda Bupe, Jerry Finley, Ann Hemphill, Ronald F. Eldonighoff, Loren G. Rease, Jonathan Yedor, Walter Gross, Gerald Mers, Michael Paubel, Tom Perrin, Ronald E. Esser, Burt Doyhistin, Hisham Sirawan, John C. Graham, Stephen Novala, Pder Stewart, Sue Ginn, Robert R. Kosge, Father J. H. Wertham, Sanford Rothman, Helen M. Hubb, James William Stalles, Charles Cull, Danny Burton.

Doss Malone, Eddie Aylward, David E. Slagle, John K. Griesel, Stephen Richards, Helen Murrell, David L. Jacobson, Mary Lee Gordon, Richard Humony, Clinton E. Trammel, Jeffrey G. Preston, Robert W. Jones, James A. Martin, Alan J. Brown, J. R. Farris, Alfred B. Kelly, Lee Miles, David B. Drummond, Rossell B. Shoell, Donald Fleet, Edward J. Jonatiss, George D. Nichol, H. R. Mehra, Jim Willsey, Louise Crawford.

Laurence Roy Latimio, Martha Glasscock, Donald Johnson, Rosalyn Barris, Kathleen Leach, Alan Kinkead, Don Ingram, Kenneth Bretches, Lawrence A. Koppers, Carley Fisher, Michael Devereau, Ralph M. Rowlett, Rolinda Rowlett, Gary L. Scholing, Reta McCall, Sherri Lee McMurry, Michael A. Greenway, Paul A. Farris, David E. Seiering, Lynn K. Treichel, Kent B. Newell, Thomas G. Johnston, Geoy A. Gale, Dr. J. C. Oliver, Gerald Link.

Ronald Dryer, Patricia L. Chamberlain, Doug St. Marie, Adella Lohli, Richard W. Meyer, W. H. Worley, Burton K. Robinson, Betty Howard, Carole Rathcoe, Larry Cox, Bill Kiems, Jerry Howard, Gerry V. Johnson, Donald E. Halt, Robert Mandler, Jesly Staurt, Patricia Hoffman, David Goddard, Dave Rowe, Sandra Riggins, Gerald L. Onlersan, Jerry Simmus, Neil Haggard.

Michael Rodgers, Mike Cunningham, Jeff Cennock, Mary Geldbach, Robert L. Mills, J. W. Kitemud, Jr., Rodney Bermin, Terry L. Anderson, John T. Nagy, Ralph Beckwith, Kenneth Geel, Kent Kukal, Mike Wallace, Whit S. Worcester, Jerry Meek, Jan Meek, Barbara J. Anderson, Vincent T. Nicosia, John Stann, Jany D. Roark, James Kessler, Michael Schwartz, Thom Clark, Eddy Thomsano, John E. Grogan.

Richard Van Meter, Ken Matten, A. C. Sakati, Mike Alassi, Gerald Folkus, Chester Bradley Bless, Jim Hobbs, Don Rabb Kappa Alpha Order, Dan Alcorn, Kathy Ruda, Richard P. Hedge, Lance Wethantex, Bob Denny, Sigma Chi, Fred Benson, John B. Crafton, Dean Bradley, Vic Kritzschan, Byron Haughn, Charles M. Berkley, USMCR, Pat Dooley, Bran Alkerson, Larry Wesselman, Jule Edward Anderson.

DeBra Ray, Bill Hancock, Bill Sebastian, Shirley Allen, Gene Turley, Bill Toldebusch, Barry Casper, James M. Robinson, T. Clark, Roger Bentley, Darlene Patricia Jost, Lucy Ann Waldeck, Bill Johnson, John C. Black, Ted L. Holt, Stephen M. Dean, Thomas Richey, Kay Segall, Richard F. Bennett, Thomas B. Lampitt, Larry C. Piros, Helen A. Bell, H. William Busch, Jr., Walter S. Strode, Pat Weast.

Elwyn Renne, Gary R. Underwood, Kent E. McMillen, Michael B. Snyder, Harriet Cohen, James Porter, Ralph Watkins, Benny Duffield, Robert Hugh Scott, Michael Letton, Lois Kreheneder, Mary Totter, Dennis Knapp, Walter L. Rehm, Jr., Don Koingas, George P. Bretbauer, Jim W. Hymes, Frances Balkenderch, Mary Jo Dawson, Robert Shaffer, Danny Minks, Robert Melton, Ronald Brune, John Lyell, Mrs. Andy Bridges.

G. Douglas Durham, Barry Sanders, Mark D. Whitlow, Edwin C. House, Jerolyn M. Onstad, J. Morton Nelson, John Perkins, Brant Stauffer, Derrell Andrews, Joe Paulsen, Earl Gylward, Ted Lee Atwood, Michael S. Shue, Cliff Faddis, Betty Sack, Dennis Snell, R. Chaffer, Joe Kallinski, Ray Villanueva, Ed Storms, Larry Sullivan, Susan Veal, Robert J. Balmor, David Steele, Sorn Baird.

Gloria Saulberg, Paul Wickens, Sally O'Hare, Frank J. Irvin III, John M. Boniface, Ron Woods, Shelia Barber, Ralph Power, Herbert Schaffer, Martin Hill, Sandy Kelly, Carol Ann Garrett, Linda Rechler, Daniel Taylor, Clark Talbert, Edythe Draffen, Kenneth R. Jeeter, Ed Maher, Jr., Dennis X. Dodson, René Rozenblit, Glenn C. Ellsworth, Michael Resnick, Katie Hulin, Jane Duryer, D. M. Robinson.

Joseph C. Smith, Larry J. Leech, Stanley A. Pollman, Doris Brike, Nance Lynch, Wm. Mays II, Richard F. Steatman, Jack Ring, Jr., Terrell L. Minor, James W. DeClue, J. W. Hopson, Ernest Wolfe, Jr., Barbara E. Barman, James N. Story, Robert G. Williams, Wm. H. Ayres, Spencer Howell, Jerry L. Wallace, Karl D. Hagh, Dorothy Sproat, Paul A. Johnson, Jr., Bill Lyons, John Koch, Charles T. Yates, Bill Neff.

Charlie G. Acrested, Mavilyn Seiff, Tim Mickle, Bonnie Suszko, Jerry Eddy, Jack M. Litman, Donald S. Singer, Dave Nixon, Gordon Jost, Michael Melvin, Leslie Small, Janet George, Jud Chalkey, Mary Ann Smith, Nancy Kloeppe, Kenneth B. Sloan, Oscar H. Calvert, Mack Sloush, Robert W. Haas, Nancy Cowan, Ellen J. Peared, Nancy Johnston, Robert V. Miller, William R. Houston, Charles Santhuff.

Michael T. Marcotte, Stephen M. Geis III, Margaret Hepworth, Carol D. Campbell, Susan Trail, John M. Bone, Lendol Vest, Richard B. Swirlington, Charles A. Shaw, Robert Allen Walther, Michael R. Deaver, Robert F. Rogers, Barbara L. Johnson, Darlene W. Edwards, James S. Skinner, Rudy Moe, Paul J. Marlan, Rex Danneill, Anne Lamkin, E. C. Reman,

Marcia M. Lewis, Joe Leurs, John M. Welch, Frederick C. Boland, Herbert Britt.

Janet Lasley, Calvin Weber, Robert A. Boelsen, Jim Holton, Raymond Dawson, John T. Hoog, Barbara K. Pence, Jennifer S. Lambert, Janice Davidson, Jerry Hagg, Sandra Pell, Barrett Glascock, Wallace H. Landes, Willard Schnaubusch, Audrey D. Wilson, Alta Garcia Myers, C. J. Smith, Mrs. C. J. Smith, Ian Nowinski, Joe Johnston, Cathy Bratek, Coleen Murphy, Wayne Thornhill, Karen A. Whaley, Carla Cox.

M. Allen Murphy, Jeff Taylor, Irma Latihiyya, Dallas D. Rhodes, Frank F. Hilton, Sandy Hallemeyer, William B. Wright, Lansing B. Demarest, Lucy E. Lockett, Diana L. Talley, Michael Reeves, Emery Morgan, Susie Schreiber, David J. Smith, Joe Flannery, Phyllis Jentry, Gayle Speiser, Jill Johnson, Claude Turner, Phaneey Livingston, Katie Blanton, Gwendolyn A. Rayford, Tom B. Ballen, Cheryl Halper, Colleen Barnhart.

Linda J. Taylor, Janet Caywood, Lyn Noblett, Pamela Preston, Barbara Joan Peters, Joseph Henson, Judy Johnston, Loran C. Young, Janice McDaniel, John Henson, Clyde H. Howell, John H. Day, Vonna Kyprigder, Michael L. Sherman, Charles F. Clements, Phil D. Wann, Garry Kalts, Michael Luther, Jr., Kathleen Costeel, Charles Emmons, Ronald J. Baslen, Alfred N. Smith, Joan Krueger, Donald Fues, Gerald M. Sill.

Ronald W. James, Burt E. Deacock, Arthur H. William, Michael Woods, Thomas Wayne Mitchell, Wm. H. McKnight, Jr., Robert Pile, Bruce Lordfather, Phanes Ervin, Karen Kay Thomson, Ronald R. Reagan, Barbara Crevello, Michelle C. Wilson, Robert N. Gould, Beverly D. Fields, Jerry L. Davenport, Ron Farley, Joan Powell, Taly Stein, Mike Woodall, Henry Blair, Bill McBride, Virginia Mooney, Karen Mitchell, Bill Hynes.

Ron Carson, Frank Sadowski, Kalers Covusburg, Elizabeth R. Overton, Pamela Higginbotham, Jim Busby, Terry Shimaru, Paul Kelchastacht, Carolyn Hellmich, Larry F. Moore, Fletcher A. Reynolds, Larry Anderson, Barbara Keur, B. S. Brown, David J. Danials, Thomas M. Wallace, Algo W. Fugit, Diane Dugan, James R. Holmes, Rosemary White, Tia Roit, Dolores Muenks, Margie Bohner, Robert K. Busch, Jr., Don White.

Merry Beth Parker, Jane Fisher, Don Welage, Thomas P. Cathy, Slenson L. Morton, Charles A. Reed, Ronald Darks, Lowell T. Cooke, Arthur C. Hoffman, Martin R. Bailey, Leslie Gene Plummer, Algird J. Valluzras, Earl N. Van Eatoy, Glenda Sue Van Eaton, Charles Alex Miller, Don E. Wickerham, Jo Hilton, Diana Pauls, Pamela E. Dunham, Richard Wayne Petersen, Susan Williamson, John E. Austin, Susie Gromer, Nancy Fowler, Lucinda Rice.

Mike Johnson, R. S. Westlister, Kenneth H. Long, Al Rubin, John F. Haslev, Suzanni Maupin, Michel W. Diviney, Roberta Beattie, Bob Swoboda, Erich C. Dueivy, Lowell Newson, William Frieth, Dale R. Hicks, Diana Lee Blackwell, Jay Chiles, Glenn Orr, Margaret Fisher, Ed Pochos, Wm. J. Kaggy, Lawrence Cook, Robert Sihauman, Eric Sowers, Charles Eddy, Peggy Diesel, Terri Brandenburg.

Galen H. Wilkes, John Franklin, Berta A. Tew, Stuart Huntner, Charles A. Musgrove, Thomas L. McRobert, Susan Hay, David Clark Zucker, Paul J. Reichert, David A. Aber, Dale C. Doerhoff, Mike Morgan, Bernice Zyk, Bob Whatley, Lee O. Elsner, Judith Ann Kern, Sandra Bayer, Joyce Roesel, David Rainbow, Tom Lener, Jr., Dale Belcher, Linda S. Moss, John W. Miller, John S. Tumel, Tom B. Latimer.

Michael E. Engel, John Wedleston, Mary Ellen Kirberg, Douglas Jones, Mike Alexander, Billy C. Dunehew, Terry G. Hayden, Michael Tellman, Perry Mudd, Jerry Fillmore, Kay Lang, Delmar Heinke, David Brown, U.S.

MCR, Richard K. Lucy, Sid A. Trojahn, Richard John Ohanesian, Glenn Germann, Sandra Lante, Frank G. Mays, II, Dick Newman, Gary W. Flick, John L. Walker, Ted Warmbold, Bruce Downey.

Bob Morfing, Benny Hainen, Greg Schuert, Gary Taylor, Steve Sailor, Tom Dowagher, Wolfgang A. Scheuder, Steve Sheppard, Delbert Meiny, James Gunderson, Russell Ramsey, A. Lee Cachery, John A. Owersado, Bill Rush, Kent Vantire, Nolan Berry, Dwight Degan, II, Ted Jenn, Denis Day Croone, Kenneth Creek, Earl Newman, William Beitz, John J. Venezons, Lawrence D. Ramsey.

Mike Hathaway, Alfred Gaskin, Hellyea Schmitt, Stanley Harrell, Marvin E. Krueger, Billy L. Gaus, Gary D. Heisel, Richard Kinder.

Charles M. O'Connor, Warren R. Brown, Richard N. Echols, Robert E. Cowan, Tim Wink, Michael S. Lechtenberg, Linda Jacobs, Maynard Davison, Linden Ousley, David S. Eblen, D. Clark Shows, William Kavanaugh, Margaret Hunt, R. J. O'Neill, Charles Pearson, Stephen Walters, Donovan Rhyndshwgen, David Hennies, Mac McCollum, Henry Beaman, James Trolley, Robert M. Siebert, Ann Rozene Trolinger, Kathleen Lally, David McConnell.

Charlie F. Hudson, James S. Michie, Harold B. Strain, Ray Lord, Sharon Allen, Barry J. Weinberg, David Crenshaw, Bob Jordan, Wilton G. Risenhoover, Kathie Watson, Richard Meyer, Allan J. Begamy, Thomas H. Hrastich, Betty Ann Morgan.

Don B. Wittenberger, Bunny Richards, Robert Lois Anderson, Geoff Gifford, Kathy Offiby, Steve Durham, John Henafin, Ronald S. Adams, Robert W. Heckemeyer, Mike Phillips, Robert Dahl, Anita Letter, Terry P. Hudson, Teresa Murray, Tom Houghton, Robert L. Royle, Diana Lynn Newton, Robert Harold Dennis, Jerome Dopplich, Larry C. Henopel, Delano P. Wegener, Karin Sue Gordon, Thomas W. Marris, Ken Ramage, Thomas Schneider.

Stephen Koonse, J. E. Weinman, D.V.M., Henry S. Staley, William O. Reicke, George R. Allman, William B. Bowie, Lyle P. Bird, Janet Kuttenkule, Raymond C. Thomaston, John D. Schaffer, Bill Shively, William Bailey, Kathy Hamilton.

Bob Faith, Keith Suchmen, Wayne Gerhardt, Jim Mealey, Paul H. Anderson, George Fadler, James R. Wencker, Walter Schwarty, Vicki L. Jaiger, John A. Gordon, Morton Wigner, Jim Schofield, Johnny Genchevy, Bob Benell, Dale W. Cleminte, W. Wade Davis, Jerry Rozell, Geland E. Haffin, Raymond D. Collins, Duane Hobbs, Robert Laughlin, Richard Powell, Kenneth M. Samuelson, Nadine Caldwell, Ray Anderson.

Ron Slaughter, Susie Barry, Linda Montgomery, Tom Stuber, Deana L. Laird, Martha S. Barnett, Richard P. Lawless, Majorie L. Kasenthal.

William Devins, James Wavvelly, Charles Richard Couchman, Gail Stantus, Robert N. Whilche, Cindy Gregg, Margaret Demien, Sandra Waldicker, Mike Bailey, Joseph J. Ingles, Thomas Dyer, Paul Clement Pritchard, John R. Snyder, Eldrid Mutlus, John N. Miller, Craig J. Layton, Emily Gordon, Linda Glascock, Salley Wright, Ron Schubel, Harold Mesle, Barry Saltzman, Allan J. Ward, Barb Harder, Dave Davenport.

John M. Howell, Donald Bradley, Rose McCall, Richard Rhodes, Mabel Joseph, Norma Logan, Gabrielle Lienhard, Eugene T. Loche, John M. Boniface, Stephen Frian, John F. Shain, Michael Geddington, Sally Stryelec.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I noticed in the Baltimore Sun of this morning the following headline: "U.S. Paratrooper Company Beaten Decisively." Now there are a great many young Americans in South Vietnam.

Those I have talked to were glad to be there. Perhaps a few were not. But none of them are primarily responsible for being there, and I would hope the Senate would do everything in its power to in turn do its part by sending everything needed to help these young Americans as they wage this war in South Vietnam.

EXPANSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate have been receiving mail from older folks about my bill, S. 350, which would blanket in under the Social Security Act all persons age 70 and over who do not now receive benefits.

I am pleased to announce that when the Senate proceeds to consider the administration tax bill, H.R. 12752, I shall offer the text of S. 350, with only minor technical changes, as an amendment to this measure.

The amendment will provide that, first, all retired people age 70 and over who do not now have insured status will be eligible for social security benefits at the rate of \$44 a month; the amount for spouses would be \$22 per month; second, the transitional insured status provisions enacted in 1965 would be repealed effective with the coming into force of my proposed amendment; third, the increased payroll taxes enacted in 1965 to cover the cost of the transitional insured status would be retained; the additional amounts needed to cover the expense of my proposal would be paid from general revenues; and, fourth, the benefit amount for persons electing to retire early at reduced benefits would not be affected at age 70.

Mr. President, this is indeed a very modest proposal. I have said for a long time that the minimum social security benefit ought to be at the very least \$70. One hundred dollars would, of course, be a more acceptable figure. However, a majority of my colleagues do not yet seem to share this view, so I am attempting to blanket in under the Social Security Act all persons age 70 and over at the minimum rate of \$44 per month.

Included among those not now protected by the law are retired farmers, retired teachers, and many other deserving persons who never had an opportunity to obtain social security coverage during their working lifetimes.

Many live in extremely reduced circumstances. They receive little help from the antipoverty program and their need is for cash.

My amendment will not answer all their problems, but it may put a can of coffee, a pound of sugar, or a bag of flour on shelves that are rather empty at the present time.

The amendment I shall offer would give social security protection to all persons age 70 and over. All who may be interested in cosponsoring this amendment should contact my office on extension 2051.

THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, last August 16, 1965, I introduced a bill for a commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government. This measure would create a new Hoover-type Commission which undertook studies of Government reorganization in the past.

Let me repeat the essence of the statement made at that time to the extent that I might note again that the Commission would be bipartisan in membership and would submit recommendations to Congress for appropriate action designed to abolish services and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of the Government or which may be found to be in competition with private enterprise.

The study proposed would proceed with a view of improving Government efficiency and effecting economies wherever possible. We have learned that it is not easy to reduce the Federal expenditures. The proposed budget for fiscal year 1967 is ample proof of this thesis. But one safe way toward better Government is by reorganizing, merging, eliminating, consolidating, and standardizing those unnecessary and wasteful practices which exist in the executive branch of the Government.

The Commission should not, to my mind, devote itself only to new recommendations but could very well evaluate those recommendations of the former Hoover Commissions which have not been implemented.

I am proud to say that some 39 Members from both sides of the aisle have joined in the cosponsorship of this bill.

I should also make note once again that the President had previously recognized the necessity for reorganization. The passage of this bill would be consistent with the recommendations of the President in his 1965 state of the Union message and would also augment the efforts of the joint committee of the House and Senate now studying ways of improving the organization and operation of Congress. The President's recent recommendation for the establishment of a Department of Transportation is another manifestation of the need for executive reorganization.

In the past 10 years, many measures have been passed which will expand the powers and bureaus of the executive branch but which will only be effective if the executive branch of the Federal Government is efficient in all its operations.

MANDATORY REPORTING OF CERTAIN INJURIES BY PHYSICIANS AND HOSPITALS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9985) to provide for the

mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Mr. PROUTY conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW TRUSTEES IN DEEDS OF TRUST IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. DOMINICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

PREMARRITAL EXAMINATION IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3314) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Mr. PROUTY conferees on the part of the Senate.

MANDATORY REPORTING BY PHYSICIANS AND INSTITUTIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF CERTAIN PHYSICAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10304) to provide for the mandatory reporting by phy-

sicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Mr. PROUTY conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. A short time ago my attention was called to some remarks made in the other body on Thursday by Representative WAYNE HAYS, of the 18th Ohio District, and ROBERT SWEENEY, Ohio Representative at large, as reported on page 4019 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD adverting to the Vietnam conflict.

According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Representative from the 18th Ohio District stated:

Mr. Chairman, there is one matter that I would like to mention. I would like to sort of apologize to the House of Representatives. There have been a lot of remarks made on the other side of this building which I believe have aided our enemies out there, because I believe they are hoping for us to get tired of this war and quit. I further believe that is the reason they think they are winning.

Yesterday the junior Senator from my State made a personal attack upon the Secretary of State and said that he ought to resign. On behalf of the people of my district, I want to apologize because I supported the junior Senator a year ago last fall.

Then Ohio's one-term Congressman at large added his two bits. He said:

On behalf of the people from the State of Ohio, I would like to join with the gentleman from Ohio. I feel we can be doves and hawks and of various opinions without resorting to such disagreeable tones.

Then he charged the junior Senator from Ohio with making an "intemperate personal attack upon the most distinguished foreign minister this Republic has had in many years," and then he said, "I certainly offer an extreme apology on the part of the people of the Buckeye State."

Emboldened by the support of his colleague, the Representative from Ohio's 18th District was so encouraged he said:

In conclusion, I would like to allude to one remark that our junior Senator made. He said he would sleep better at night if somebody else were Secretary of State. Well, if he sleeps at the switch much more than he does now, he will be asleep 24 hours a day.

Mr. President, I am not so much concerned by the personal vituperation of these two Representatives as I am by their attack on the integrity of the U.S. Senate and its Members. By innuendo and direct statements, they have charged that the junior Senator from Ohio was one of those on the "other side of this building"—in other words, Members of

the Senate—who have "aided our enemies out there"—meaning the Vietcong. Mr. President, may I say in passing that centuries ago Samuel Johnson said, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel."

I am taking the floor on a question of personal privilege. I repudiate the allegations made in the House of Representatives by the Representative from the 18th Ohio District and the one-term Ohio Representative at large that—

A lot of remarks made on the other side of this building * * * have aided our enemies out there.

In face, the statements made by the Representative from the 18th Ohio District and specifically endorsed by the Representative at large who took upon themselves as censors and self-acknowledged superduper patriots the mission to impugn the loyalty of U.S. Senators, including the junior Senator from Ohio, falsely assailing our loyalty and patriotism. I repudiate such misconduct and statements of these two Ohio Members of the other body. I assert what they said is in direct violation of the rules of the House of Representatives in which I had the honor to serve as Ohio Congressman at large for four terms.

Mr. President, I propound a parliamentary inquiry: Would it be a violation of the rules of the Senate were I to assert in this Chamber at this time that Representative HAYS, of Ohio, and one-term Representative SWEENEY, of Ohio, are guilty of falsely, viciously, and maliciously making stupid, lying statements assailing the loyalty and patriotism of Senators, including the junior Senator from Ohio, and that they are liars in alleging that we "have aided our enemies"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). In response to the inquiry of the Senator from Ohio, the Chair states that under the precedents it has been held not in order in debate for a Senator to make reference to action by the House of Representatives. Also, it has been held out of order for Senators to make reference to Members of the House or to refer to a Member of the House by name, to criticize the action of the Speaker, to refer in debate to a Member of the House in opprobrious terms, or to impute to him unworthy motives.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I, of course, abide by the ruling of the Chair, and I respect it. If, however, on some future occasion a similar contemptible attack is made on me with the insect-like buzzing of lying allegations by either or both of these publicity seekers, I shall surely embalm and embed them in the liquid amber of my remarks. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I have one other request to make; then I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a column entitled "Impact of War Stirs Politicians," written by Marquis Childs, an internationally respected columnist, and published in the Washington Post of February 21, 1966.

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

IMPACT OF WAR STIRS POLITICIANS
(By Marquis Childs)

At the "liberal" table in the House of Representatives dining room at the Capitol you can hear two diametrically opposed views of the politics of the Vietnam war. The advice from hard-boiled House veterans such as WAYNE HAYES, Democrat, of Ohio, is, "Keep your head down, don't get tangled up in the row over what to do in Vietnam if you want to come through the 1966 election."

Other Democrats challenge this view. They believe they have a duty in all conscience to speak out. They have called for a continued pause in the bombing, for action by the United Nations, for sterner efforts to negotiate. They have done this as the Republicans, with few exceptions, have followed the tactic of cautious silence in the belief that a Democratic split is bound to help them in the congressional elections this fall.

Certainly no one could have foreseen 6 months ago that the massive Democratic majorities in the Senate and House would be so riven by an issue with such deep emotional overtones. What the consequences will be not only for 1966 but for the long-term future of the party and for 1968 is at this stage the great unanswered question.

While it may not be subject to poll-taking measurement there can be little doubt of the loss the Johnson administration has suffered. It comes from academic, church, and other groups with a deep concern over Vietnam. It comes, too, from those who voted against Barry Goldwater in 1964 but without very much enthusiasm for Lyndon Johnson.

They are relatively few in number and the hard boiled would dismiss them as knee-jerk liberals and bleeding hearts. But in one important respect their contritition far outweighs their size as a small minority in the great Democratic mass. Over the past two or three decades, and particularly during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, they supplied the steam of idealism and ideas that gave their party a vital appeal. The hard-core supporters of the late Adlai Stevenson, they saw in him the idealism, the hope, that inspired them to do the hard work of political organization.

In the present House 74 Democrats are first termers, although of this number 4 had served before and suffered defeat prior to the Johnson landslide. The vulnerable seats are those that were won by less than 5 percent of the vote cast—62 Democrats, 50 Republicans. Conspicuous targets in November will be first-term Democrats elected in traditionally Republican territory.

Iowa is a case in point. The Republican delegation was decimated with only one survivor out of the seven congressional districts. The Democrats elected in the Johnson sweep are younger men with notable war records out of World War II or Korea who have done the spadework of political organization at the beginning level.

Typical is JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, of Iowa City, formerly a professor of constitutional law at the University of Iowa. He supports the President's policy on Vietnam, but he was one of 76 Representatives calling for submission of the conflict to the United Nations and a year ago he had joined in asking for open hearings by the House Foreign Relations Committee on Vietnam. Feeling strongly the issue should be debated, SCHMIDHAUSER is disturbed that he gets little or no mail on Vietnam while excise taxes and 14(b) draw a deluge.

JOHN G. DOW, a businessman, the first Democrat in this century to win in New York's 27th District in the Hudson Valley, has been an outspoken critic of Vietnam policy. He was the only first termer to vote

against the Vietnam supplemental appropriation last fall. Dow defeated Mrs. Katharine St. George who had served in the House 18 years. His share of the vote was 51.06 percent and his district will be closely watched to gauge the political effect of the war.

On the Senate side two Democrats up for reelection were among the 15 who signed the letter appealing to President Johnson to continue the bombing pause. Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, is expected to win reelection with little difficulty, since he is so closely identified with the destiny of the new State.

But Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, is already discovering that he will confront the Vietnam issue. His likely opponent is the Republican Governor, Tim Babcock, far to the right of center. In his speeches around the State Babcock is saying that now we are in Vietnam we must win.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor, but I shall first be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do not yield the floor. Mr. President, first, I want to know if any Senator can get into the "fight," since it appears to be a free-for-all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; indeed.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes. I was about to yield the floor, but I shall yield for a comment by the minority leader, with whom I also had the honor to serve in the other body years ago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the sake of clarification and a meticulous interpretation of the rules, I should like to inquire whether calling a Member of another body a liar is an imputation of improper motive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Under the precedents, that would not be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That has nothing to do with motive. You just plain call him a liar; what you regard as a statement of fact.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Evidently that is a fact. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Would I be correct in assuming that the junior Senator from Ohio, keen lawyer that he is, proceeds on the basis that the truth is always a defense?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is correct. I yield the floor.

AMBASSADOR LODGE: LET'S GET ON SIDE OF LITTLE MAN IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, we are not doing the kind of educational, agricultural, health, land-reform job in Vietnam we can do and must do.

It is true that we have made some brilliant achievements in these areas in Vietnam. We have proved that we can make an excellent contribution, but it has been far too little. There has been no satisfactory answer from the administration to the glaring contrast between the 1 American who is in Vietnam for all non-military purposes and the 200 soldiers, sailors, and marines.

The administration has made no justification for the pathetic \$1 we are spending on education, agriculture, health, and land reform for every \$400 we are spending on war in Vietnam.

Mr. President a dramatic and sharp step-up—well beyond the budgeted program for nonmilitary action in Vietnam—is needed for two reasons:

First. To shorten the war and permit us to win a victory that would leave a Vietnam not totally devastated by war.

Second. To have a fighting chance for freedom and independence to win the election that we now recognize we must face after the cease-fire becomes effective. Unless we initiate a far more ambitious program of land reform and education, unless we do a much better job for the majority of Vietnamese who are landless, and for the overwhelming majority who have not graduated and will not graduate from grade school, we are not going to win any election in which most of the people in Vietnam vote.

Yesterday the New York Times quoted our own Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge as saying in Vietnam:

For years now in southeast Asia, the only people who have been doing anything for the little man at the grassroots—to lift him up—have been the Communists.

On Friday the Washington Post reported that Gen. Edward Lansdale, the man who has been so eminently successful in fighting the Communists by leading a counter social revolution in the Philippines and who has a similar assignment in South Vietnam, is being smothered in bureaucratic redtape and given pitifully inadequate support in his immensely vital and onerous job.

General Lansdale is Ambassador Lodge's "special assistant."

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times report on Ambassador Lodge's plea for more political emphasis and the article on General Lansdale be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

POLITICAL GAIN IS VITAL TO VICTORY,
LODGE SAYS

SAIGON, February 26.—The U.S. Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, maintains that unless the South Vietnamese Government has a solid political program, the war with the Vietcong can drag on for 20 years.

Mr. Lodge, in an interview made public today, said:

"For years now in southeast Asia, the only people who have been doing anything for the little man at the grassroots—to lift him up—have been the Communists.

"This is a political war with violent military and criminal overtones. You can have military success and you can have success against the criminal element, and if you're not ready with a program which is going to make the man adhere to the Government and believe in the Government, you haven't accomplished anything durable."

FAILURE TO PRODUCE VIET MIRACLES PUTS
GENERAL LANSDALE ON DEFENSIVE
(By Stanley Karnow)

SAIGON, February 24.—When he arrived in Saigon last summer as American Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge's special assistant, Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale was widely publicized as the man who could guide South

Vietnam's leaders toward the kind of social revolution necessary to defeat communism.

Lansdale was, after all, a living legend. He had helped President Ramon Magsaysay to defeat the Communist-led Huk rebels in the Philippines. Operating behind the scenes, he aided President Ngo Dinh Diem to consolidate his power in Saigon after 1954. To his own distress, Lansdale was expected to repeat those miracles when he returned here.

Now, nearly 6 months later, it is widely acknowledged here that Lansdale has performed no miracles. Instead, the key question is whether he has been able to do anything even remotely significant.

His adversaries, who are numerous within the U.S. mission, contend that Lansdale and his 11-man team have failed to make the slightest impact on the Vietnam situation. They support this view by pointing out that, in a major reorganization last week, Lansdale was bypassed and authority for overall non-military programs was vested in Deputy Ambassador William G. Porter, a career diplomat.

Several of Lansdale's own subordinates agree that their group has accomplished little. However, they blame their lack of achievement on opposition within the vast U.S. bureaucracy here. As they explain it, Lansdale's efforts have been chronically sabotaged by American agency heads jealous of their prerogatives.

More cautious American officials, fearful of controversy, strive to shroud Lansdale in the ambiguous jargon that characterizes much establishment syntax here. To cite one senior U.S. diplomat: "Ed is showing fine capabilities in coordinating concepts."

Attempts to evaluate Lansdale's operation fairly are hampered by the fact that nobody here can quite define the role it was initially designed to fulfill.

Some of his original backers in Washington, among them Vice President HUMPHREY and Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, saw Lansdale bringing to the highly militarized Vietnam situation the philosophies that had accounted for his earlier triumphs in the Philippines and Saigon. Like the harmonica-playing Colonel Hillendale in "The Ugly American," for whom he is the model, Lansdale was expected to win the confidence of the Vietnamese and help them to create sound, popular leadership.

In theory, at least, Lansdale was suited to the task. On previous occasions he had displayed an almost uncanny ability to drop into a strange setting, mix with the people, understand the problem, recommend a remedy, and assist in its implementation. And he was at his best when he played a solo hand, personifying American power for his native proteges.

But the Vietnam which Lansdale entered last year was far different from the scenes of his past glories. There were no visible leaders comparable to the dynamic Magsaysay or even the stubbornly nationalistic Diem. More important, the U.S. mission in Saigon had proliferated into a huge bureaucratic machine.

LACKED AUTHORITY

Within this bureaucracy, Lansdale soon found himself just another American official. Moreover, without the authority or finances of U.S. agency under his command, he lacked real weight—a fact the clever Vietnamese were quick to surmise.

Thus, Lansdale and his assistants might spend heady evenings with Vietnamese listening to folk songs and discussing their hopes and dreams. When it came to hard business, however, the Vietnamese went elsewhere. Or, as one high Saigon official put it:

"Mr. Lansdale is a wonderful man. But when our ministry needs money we see the AID people."

Without real authority, furthermore, Lansdale's team has been unable to function decisively in the various programs classified under the awkward heading of "pacification." Newspaper reports to the contrary, Lansdale was not instrumental in training rural police units and political action groups, which were organized by AID and the CIA respectively.

Nor has Lansdale served as an intermediary with the Vietnamese leaders on crucial issues such as peace negotiations or general U.S. policy.

Several U.S. Embassy officials also claim that Lansdale and his subordinates never really developed enough independent sources of information to justify their claim to being the eyes and ears of the mission.

In short, as one of Lansdale's own men summed it up:

"We haven't really done anything that couldn't have been done by any bureaucrats."

REPORTS PROLIFERATE

In a curious way, the antibureaucratic Lansdale team has itself taken on bureaucratic trappings. Its members probably turn out as many reports and memorandums as any other Government agency, and they devote themselves intensively to all sorts of minutiae.

They have recently been deliberating, for example, whether the Saigon government could decently refer to the "fatherland," a term frequently employed by the Communists. Not long ago they came forth with the suggestion that the South Vietnamese post office issue a stamp portraying the different nations contributing to the war effort here.

A few Lansdale team members work on heavier subjects. One in particular has produced important studies on economic warfare techniques used by the Communists.

Lansdale himself is often credited with having given a certain currency to the expression of "social revolution" that figures in many statements by South Vietnam's Premier Nguyen Cao Ky.

Essentially, explains a seasoned American official here, the Lansdale group has not been able to meet the requirements of the present Vietnam situation. As he put it: "We are up against a superb Communist organization that must be uprooted by a better organization. This simply cannot be done by a few men of good will."

AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE OPPOSES CUTS IN SCHOOL LUNCH, SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the February issue of the American Parents Committee's "Washington Report on Legislation for Children" sharply criticizes the administration's plans to cut the special milk program for schoolchildren by 80 percent.

I would like to read into the RECORD for the benefit of my 43 Senate colleagues who have cosponsored my bill to make the school milk program permanent a few of the excellent points made by this newsletter.

First, the publication points out:

Just as our public school system is available to all children, so must the school lunch and special (school) milk programs continue to be made available to all children. In his state of the Union message, the President pledged that the Nation's children must not be the victims of a false economy. Yet, curiously enough, the 1967 budget recommends that only those children too poor to pay be permitted to participate in these programs. * * * The specter of discrimination-in-reverse would become a reality if local administrators were forced to pin a poor

child label on some children in order to eliminate others from eligibility.

Mr. President, this is the first time to my knowledge that this concept of discrimination in reverse has been discussed in connection with the school milk program. In exploring this concept the newsletter goes on to say:

The sensitivity of the poorer child is disregarded in the 1967 budget proposal, and those supporting full continuance of the school lunch and milk programs can justifiably evoke the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

Perhaps the strongest point made in support of funding the school milk program at its present level was:

The American School Food Service Association, whose members are local administrators responsible for the proven success of the school lunch and milk programs, has reported that when local costs of these programs have had to be raised 5 to 10 cents, approximately one-third of the participating students have dropped out of the programs. The situation would be even worse if the 1967 budget proposals are not changed.

What better reason is there to fight against the crippling cuts proposed by the administration—cuts which could easily kill an overwhelmingly popular program of proven merit?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire 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:

SCHOOL LUNCH AND MILK PROGRAMS

In a recent nationwide CBS television interview, APC's executive director was asked why we have consistently supported the national school lunch and milk programs. We noted that, ever since its enactment in 1946, the school lunch program has proven itself to be an outstanding bargain for the taxpaying parents' dollar. The 20 years of the program's operation have been marked by efficient and economical management. Its success has been attested by an average 5-percent annual increase in participation, with the current total of well over 17 million schoolchildren. A similar record of sound management and increase in participation (particularly in OEO's Headstart groups) holds true for the special milk program, enacted in 1954.

Under the Department of Agriculture's surplus commodity purchase plan, the Federal Government has bought up the perennial surpluses (now termed "reserves" in the new food-for-freedom bill) of foodstuffs and dairy products—of particular price-support benefit to the American farmer—and distributed these products throughout the States. This plan has aided local administrators in achieving low-cost balanced lunches for all schoolchildren, when supplemented by local purchases made possible by cash reimbursements under the program.

The American Parents Committee is convinced that, just as our public school system is available to all children, so must the school lunch and milk programs continue to be made available to all children. In his state of the Union message, the President pledged that the Nation's children must not be the victims of a false economy. Yet, curiously enough, the 1967 budget recommends that only those children too poor to pay, be permitted to participate in these programs. Such a proposal overlooks two important points. First, the specter of discrimination in reverse would become a reality, if local school administrators were forced to pin a "poor child" label on some children in order

to eliminate others from eligibility. Secondly, a provision of the National School Lunch Act specifies that local school administrators are required to provide school lunches without cost to needy students, without separating them from the pay-as-you-eat students. This provision has been in force ever since 1946, when the program was enacted; and to change such an arrangement would require amending legislation.

In every public school system, there is inevitably a wide range of economic backgrounds among the students. The sensitivity of the poorer child is disregarded in the 1967 budget proposal, and those supporting full continuance of the school lunch and milk programs can justifiably evoke the "equal protection" clause of the 14th amendment.

The American School Food Service Association, whose members are local administrators responsible for the proven success of the school lunch and milk programs, has reported that when local costs of these programs have had to be raised 5 to 10 cents, approximately one-third of the participating students have dropped out of the programs. This situation would be even worse, if the 1967 budget proposals are not changed.

AIRLINES ANNOUNCE RECORD PROFITS: TIME TO CUT AVIATION SUBSIDY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the year 1964 was a good one for the Nation's airlines; but last year was out of this world. Profits for the last 3 months of the year, for example have just been disclosed as 50 percent higher than in the comparable period in 1964.

Yet subsidies to aviation are climbing to a record high. In 1957 they were about \$220 million. This year the budget recommends well over \$900 million.

At a time when we face a tight budget, when it is recommended that we virtually gut the school milk program to save money, does it make any sense for this immensely profitable industry to receive bigger subsidies than ever?

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Washington Daily News, reporting the level of recent airline revenues and profits, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PROFITS UP 50 PERCENT, REVENUES 18 PERCENT—AIRLINES FLYING HIGH (By Robert Dietsch)

In our highflying business boom, few industries are flying higher than the airlines: Last year, their revenues came to around \$2.3 billion—18 percent higher than 1964 and triple those of 1955.

Their profits in the last 3 months of 1965 were more than 50 percent higher than the comparable 1964 period.

They are luring more and more Americans into traveling by air. To be sure (as the Northern Trust Co. of Chicago puts it), "Business travel still accounts for two-thirds of all airline trips, (but) personal trips, which are longer on the average, now produce nearly one-half of industry revenues as compared with 40 percent 10 years ago."

This is fine reading for airline executives and stockholders.

But for the public the most interesting news concerns fares.

Thanks to prodding by the Civil Aeronautics Board and some industry mavericks it costs less to fly today than ever before.

Also fares come in a variety of packages—something for everybody from clergymen and college students to wives and kids.

Nonetheless, problems remain: Spending on new aircraft will continue high for years to come.

The lines continue to add seat capacity; to keep up earnings they must continue to increase business 15 percent or more each year.

DIESEL-POWERED VESSELS ARE ONE ANSWER TO OUR MERCHANT MARINE PROBLEM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, over the past few months we have witnessed an intensifying debate, both in Congress and within the administration, over the future of our merchant marine. This debate has been sparked by disclosures that our shipping industry simply is not able to meet the demands of the Vietnam war. It has become increasingly obvious that the United States is fast becoming, if, indeed, it is not already, a second rate shipping power.

Two reports on this tragic situation were made late last year by a maritime task force made up of administration personnel and by the Maritime Advisory Committee, composed of industry representatives. Unfortunately, these reports are diametrically opposed on many points. The consequence seems to be a policy deadlock which has to this date prevented the submission of a suggested program to Congress.

I strongly believe, Mr. President, that at least one factor in the decreased efficiency of our merchant marine in comparison with those of other maritime nations is our failure to use the most effective technology. More specifically, this Nation has failed to adequately utilize diesel engines in its merchant marine.

Let us look at the facts. As of December 1, 1965, only 129 out of 1,916 vessels of 2,000 tons or more deadweight under construction in the world's shipyards were steamers. In other words, 1,787, or more than 90 percent, were diesel propelled. Yet 43 of 50 ships under contract in the United States were steam turbine propelled. The seven U.S. diesel-propelled vessels were oceanographic or survey ships. These facts show beyond a shadow of a doubt that the diesel engine is more economical than the steam-turbine engine. The facts also show that we are not utilizing this superior propulsion.

Mr. President, an article which will be appearing in the April issue of Diesel and Gas Turbine Progress gives the facts and figures on the impressive performance of diesel engines. I hope that Senators will read this fine article. If we are to rebuild an effective merchant marine, the issue of diesel versus steam power must be given the utmost consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the 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:

LARGE, HIGH-PERFORMANCE CARGO VESSELS USE DIESELS

One of the primary objections to the use of large direct-drive, marine diesel propul-

sion power brought forth by U.S.-flag vessel operators and the Maritime Commission in Washington concerns large, high-performance cargo vessels. U.S. operators apparently feel that the diesel is not economically applicable to these type vessels, which make up the bulk of their future shipbuilding plans. It is felt apparently by both the Maritime Commission and ship operators in this country that the diesel takes up too much space that could be devoted to cargo and cannot deliver the speeds desired. We have developed a representative listing of cargo and cargo-liner type vessels over 10,000 tons deadweight that have been built recently throughout the world and equipped with diesel propulsion. This listing is taken from the excellent statistics published by the Motor Ship magazine in England. It is obvious that diesels are in great favor throughout the world for the latest designs in large, high-speed cargo vessels; and it would seem that the information contained in this article would allay the fears of U.S.-flag operators and the Maritime Commission as to the practicality of diesel propulsion in this type service.

Two of the highest power cargo liners ever put into service are the *Southampton Castle* and the *Gold Hope Castle*. These two vessels have gone into regular service for the British and Commonwealth Shipping Co. on high-speed runs to Cape Town, South Africa. They both can handle mixed refrigerated and general cargoes and take only 11½ days for the 6,000-mile voyage. They are each equipped as twin-screw vessels with two Wallsend-Sulzer type 8RD90, 8-cylinder, 2-cycle diesels rated 17,600 horsepower apiece for a total combined horsepower of 35,000 approximately for each ship at an engine speed of 119 revolutions per minute. These engines operate on heavy fuel and with this power can deliver an average voyage speed of 22½ knots. The vessels are 13,152 gross tons each, with cargo capacity of 598,000 cubic feet; of this capacity, approximately 380,300 cubic feet is insulated for refrigerated cargo.

In Germany, an interesting series of cargo vessels have been recently built. The *Tabora*, representative of this group, is a 13,500-ton deadweight vessel powered by a 9,600-horsepower MAN K6Z78/155 direct-drive diesel giving a ship service speed of 19 knots.

The *Clan Ramsay*, another high-speed cargo liner built for the British and Commonwealth Shipping Co. for fast service to South African ports, is an 11,500-deadweight-ton vessel powered with a 10,350-horsepower Kincaid-Burmeister & Wain diesel. This ship features advanced automatic control arrangements for the engineroom and virtually all the total cargo capacity of 527,000 cubic feet is refrigerated. This is the first of a new class that will include at least four ships.

The 12,070-deadweight-ton *Sharistan*, owned by the Strick Line, Ltd., is another new cargo vessel of advanced design. Bridge control of the 10,000-horsepower Doxford main diesel propulsion engine is featured along with automatic starting and control of generator sets and pumps. This ship has a cargo capacity of 676,000 cubic feet and a service speed of 17 knots. It is reported to be the fastest ship in the Persian Gulf service.

The brandnew *Australia Star*, owned by the Blue Star Line is powered with a Vickers-Sulzer 8-cylinder 8RD90 diesel rated at 17,600 horsepower. She is an 11,600-ton-deadweight cargo liner with a service speed of 20 knots. Length overall is 526 feet; breadth, molded, is 70 feet; depth, molded, is 41 feet, 9 inches; and draft, loaded, is 30 feet. This vessel will be used in the Europe-Australia run.

Large, high performance, diesel-equipped cargo vessels over 10,000 tons completed in 1965

Builders	Name of ship	Type	Owner	Tonnage deadweight	Engine-builders and design	Engine data	B.H.P.	Service speed knots
UNITED KINGDOM								
Charles Connell & Co. (Ship-builders). Austin & Pickersgill	Benedi	Cargo liner	Ben Line Steamers	13,000	Barclay, Curle-Sulzer	9RD90	20,700	21.0
	Exning	Cargo	Atlantic Shipping & Trading Co.	16,000	Clark-Sulzer	6RD76	9,600	17.0
	Inishowen Head	Cargo liner	Head Line	10,050	do	6RD76	9,600	17.0
	Australia Star	do	Blue Star Line	11,600	Vickers-Sulzer	8RD90	17,600	19.0
Burntisland Shipbuilding Co. Wm. Doxford & Sons (Ship-builders).	Tenbury	Cargo	Alexander Shipping Co.	11,620	Brown-Sulzer	6RD76	9,600	16.0
	Aliki Livanos	do	Monrovia Tramp Shipping Co.	16,520	Doxford	6PT6	9,000	15.8
John Readhead & Sons	Sharistan	Cargo liner	Strick Line	12,100	do	6PT6	10,000	17.0
	Floristan	do	do	12,100	do	6PT6	10,000	17.0
Swan, Hunter & Wigham Richardson	Southampton Castle	do	British & Commonwealth Shipping Co.	11,120	Wallsend-Sulzer	8RD90	2X17,600	22.5
	Good Hope Castle	do	do	11,120	do	8RD90	2X17,600	22.5
BRAZIL								
Ishikawagima do Brasil	Puebla	Cargo	Comissao de Marinha Mercante	13,000	Ishibras-Sulzer	7RD68	7,700	15.3
	Presidente Kennedy	do	do	13,000	do	7RD68	7,700	15.3
DENMARK								
Nakskov Shipyard	Ancona	Cargo liner	East Asiatic Co.	9,390/12,770	B. & W.	1074VT 2BF160	15,000	20.8
FRANCE								
At. et Ch. de la Seine Maritime	Ville de Lyon	do	Nouvelle Cie. Harvraise Peninsulaire	12,000	Atlantique B. & W.	874VT 2BF160	12,000	19.0
GERMANY								
Blohm & Voss	Hammonia	do	Hamburg-America Line	12,544	M.A.N.	K9Z86/160	18,900	21.0
	Alemannia	do	do	12,544	M.A.N.	K9Z86/160	18,900	21.0
	Borussia	do	do		M.A.N.	K9Z86/160	18,900	21.0
Deutsche Werft	Tabora	Cargo	Deutsche Afrika Linien	13,500	M.A.N.	K6Z78/155	9,600	18.2
	Talana	do	do	10,400	M.A.N.	K6Z78/155	9,600	19.0
H. C. Stilleken Sohn	Republica del Ecuador	Cargo liner	Flota Mercante Gran Colombiana	12,450	Sulzer	9RD76	14,400	19.0
HOLLAND								
Rotterdam Dockyard Co.	Moerdijk	do	Holland-American Line	12,500	Stork	SW6x85/170B	14,000	18.5
JAPAN								
Hitachi Shipbuilding & Engineering Co.	Straat Futami	do	Royal Interocean Lines	12,068	Hitachi-B & W	684VT2 BF180	13,500	19.0
	Straat Fushimi	do	do	11,878	do	684VT2 BF180	13,500	19.0
Kawasaki Dockyard	Tennessee Maru	Cargo	Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha	11,550	Kawasaki-M.A.N.	K9Z70/120C	11,250	17.3
	Denmark Maru	do	do	10,500	do	K8Z70/120C	10,000	17.5
	Holland Maru	do	do	10,500	do	K8Z70/120C	10,000	17.5
Mitsubishi H.I.	Iso Maru	Cargo liner	Nippon Yusen Kaisha	12,500	Mitsubishi-Sulzer	6RD90	15,000	15.0
	Yamagata Maru	do	do	12,800	Mitsubishi		13,000	19.5
Namura Shipbuilding Co.	Rio de Janeiro Maru	do	Mitsui O.S.K. Lines	11,470	Mitsubishi-Sulzer	6RD68	7,200	15.4
	Iyo Maru	do	Nippon Yusen K.K.	12,500	Yokohama-M.A.N.	K6Z78/140D	10,000	18.2
Nippon Kokan K.K.	Ibargi Maru	Cargo	Nippon Yusen Kaisha	12,500	Mitsubishi-M.A.N.	K6Z78/140D	10,000	18.2
SWEDEN								
Uddevallavarvet A/B	London Citizen	do	London & Overseas Freighters	15,120	Uddevalle-Götaaverken	760/1500 VG88U	10,000	17.5
YUGOSLAVIA								
Brodogradiliste Uljanik	Dmitri Gulia	do	U.S.S.R.	12,000	Uljanik-B & W	874VT2 BF160	12,000	18.4
	Nazim Khikmet	do	U.S.S.R.	12,000	do	874VT2 BF160	12,000	18.4
	Alexandr Grin	do	U.S.S.R.	12,000	do	874VT2 BF160	12,000	18.4
	Arkadij Gaidar	do	U.S.S.R.	12,000	do	874VT2 BF160	12,000	18.4

Large diesel equipped cargo vessels recently launched

Name of ship	Yard No.	Owners	Builders	Tonnage deadweight	Machinery	B.H.P.	Speed knots
Cantuarua (cargo)	701B7	Comissao de Marinha Mercante	Verolme Estaleiros Reunis do Brasil	10,560/12,530	Verolme-M.A.N.	8,400	18.4
Apj Ambika (cargo liner)	375	Apeejay Lines, Surrendra Overseas	Rheinstahl Nordseewerke	15,000	M.A.N.	8,400	16.0
Oriental Queen (cargo liner)	869	Malaysia Marine Corp.	Uraga Heavy Industries Co.	12,500	Uraga-Sulzer	12,800	19.5

Ships completed, 2,000 tons deadweight and above, 1963-65

Year	Diesel		Steam		Total	
	Number of ships	Tons deadweight	Number of ships	Tons deadweight	Number of ships	Tons deadweight
1965	698	13,512,540	77	3,753,430	775	17,265,970
1964	582	9,438,570	75	3,930,430	657	13,368,010
1963	547	7,910,980	108	4,342,190	655	12,253,170

**REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK BILL
ENDORSED BY STATE GOVERN-
MENT OF CALIFORNIA AND BY
PIONEER CONSERVATION GROUP,
SAVE THE REDWOODS LEAGUE**

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last week I introduced a bill to establish a Redwood National Park in northern California. I am grateful that a number of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, have joined me as cosponsors. The proposed legislation has the support of the President, the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and many other organizations, including the government of the State of California.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a telegram I have received from the distinguished chief executive of my State, Edmund G. Brown, fully endorsing the proposed legislation and particularly commending those features of the bill which provide for a smooth and equitable adjustment of the areas to be affected in the creation of a National Redwood Park.

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

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
February 24, 1966.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Confirmation of telegram sent yesterday. I fully endorse your support and your action today in sponsoring legislation to create a National Redwoods Park in northern California.

Since 1879 there have been proposals for such a redwood park. To no avail. Now with the united efforts of President Johnson, Secretary Udall, you and Senator JACKSON, and conservation-minded people of the Nation, we can fulfill this dream. Any further delay and it will be too late.

I was particularly pleased to note that the legislation includes the elements you and I have insisted are essential—economic adjustment payments to preserve the tax base of the area, a greatly speeded up schedule for creation of the new park to insure jobs and business development immediately, and a program for rounding out and improving existing State parks.

I urge you and Senator JACKSON to schedule early hearings in order that every aspect of this proposed legislation can be fully explored and perfecting amendments made so that the Redwoods National Park legislation can be enacted without further delay.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD a telegram of endorsement that I have received from Mr. Newton B. Drury, secretary of the Save the Redwoods League. I value this endorsement highly. The Redwood League is the pioneer conservation organization in this redwood area. In a recent statement, the Ford Foundation pointed out:

Since it was founded in 1918, the league has defrayed (through private contribution) roughly one-half of the total cost of the State's (California's) 28 redwood parks whose current value is estimated at over \$250 million.

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

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.
February 24, 1966.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Glad to learn from the press that you support the National Park Service plan as recommended by the President for a Redwood National Park including Mill Creek Watershed, Jedediah Smith and Del Norte coast redwoods. Preservation of this area as an ecological unit and representative example of outstanding virgin redwood forest has been a top priority in the program of the Save the Redwoods League for over 30 years. Our board of directors on April 9, 1965, took action recommending this area as a Redwood National Park for many reasons including outstanding quality, administrative and protective consideration, and feasibility.

NEWTON B. DRURY,
Secretary,
Save the Redwoods League.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I invite attention to the league's statement that the preservation of a national park including the Mill Creek watershed and the State parks in Del Norte County as a single ecological unit has been a top priority in the league's program for more than 30 years.

I am confident that, as we continue to examine this problem, the bill which I have introduced will find increasing support.

The purpose of the league's program is the same as that of the program of the proposed legislation.

A RECORD OF MISJUDGMENT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in one of the Nation's great newspapers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, there was recently published an editorial regarding the statements of Gen. Maxwell Taylor. Personally, I lack confidence in his judgment and in his statements regarding Vietnam.

Last June when he testified before a joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, he predicted that the Hanoi government would not commit its army fully to the conflict in South Vietnam. He stated:

They would not do it because they know we would destroy their economy.

Recently he stated that there are three of North Vietnam's eight combat divisions presently fighting us in South Vietnam. If this later statement is accurate, then his previous prediction is just another of his statements proved wrong.

Furthermore, at this same committee hearing when questioned regarding the then civilian Prime Minister of the Saigon government, Quat, he stated he was certain this government was stable and would not be overthrown by a coup. Evidently, General Taylor's guess was fantastically wrong, or if based on information furnished by our CIA, his intelligence was bad. The committee records show his answers. The facts are that within the following 48 hours, before General Taylor left the United States for

Vietnam, 10 generals operating one of those frequent Saigon coups, overturned the civilian Prime Minister and shortly thereafter the present Prime Minister, Ky, was installed by these generals.

Incidentally, Ky was born and reared near Hanoi. Some members of his present cabinet were also born and reared in North Vietnam. This is just further evidence that we are involved in a miserable civil war in Vietnam.

The chairman in South Vietnam of the National Liberation Front, so-called, is Nguyen Huu Tho, a Saigon lawyer, who, it is stated, is not a Communist. This National Liberation Front was formed years ago. It is said the Vietcong military units come under its direction. Also, it has representatives at Hanoi and at the capitals of other Asiatic, African, and European nations. Of course, if there are negotiations to bring about peace, it would be futile to give in to the demands of Air Marshal Ky of the Saigon government and bar representatives of the Vietcong. There can be no cease-fire or armistice secured at the conference table unless representatives of the Vietcong are present as delegates independent of the delegates of the Hanoi and Saigon governments.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial referred to from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "A Long Record of Misjudgment" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A LONG RECORD OF MISJUDGMENT

Victory is just around the corner. That is the message Gen. Maxwell Taylor sought to convey to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the hearings on Vietnam Thursday. The general's sincerity is not to be doubted, nor is there any doubt that his optimistic forecast if believable would be most welcome to the American people. But it must be measured against earlier promises of imminent success that did not materialize, and against conflicting forecasts, within the past few days, of a long, hard war.

The unhappy truth is that at every stage of this escalating conflict whenever Congress raised questions about the deepening commitment, administration spokesmen have painted a rosy picture of imminent victory which subsequent events wiped out. General Taylor himself, along with Secretary McNamara, has repeatedly misjudged the situation. In October 1963, for example, he and Secretary McNamara returned from an inspection tour to announce officially "their judgment that the major part of the (American) military task can be completed by the end of 1965."

In 1965 the United States had 15,000 troops in Vietnam. Today there are 205,000 troops on the ground and another 100,000 naval and air forces are engaged.

No matter how sincere General Taylor may have been in his 1963 estimate, or in his present one, the fact is inescapable that he has been disastrously and repeatedly wrong in the past and his judgment must therefore be questioned today. The record is incontrovertible, it seems to us, that the authors of this Vietnam war, who have repeatedly advised the President to escalate just once more in the hope of an elusive victory, have never really understood what they were getting the American people into. The time is long past to reject this kind of advice.

The idea that we have once more turned a corner and are now on the way to victory is also controverted by testimony before Congress, released only this week, of Mr. McNamara and Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. They were not before television cameras but behind closed doors. In the heavily censored transcript of their evidence before the Senate Armed Services Committee, both indicated the Pentagon looks forward to a long and difficult war lasting many years. Though they denied that final decisions have been taken, there is no doubt that the Pentagon is thinking in terms of putting at least 600,000 troops into Vietnam before the often predicted victory is attained.

And yet that prediction of victory, like others before it, rests upon imponderables which can destroy it—in this case, on the hunch, guess or hope that another escalation of such magnitude will not bring China with its millions of troops into the war.

General Taylor plainly revealed, perhaps unconsciously, why there is such a discrepancy between the limited war which the administration proclaims and the unlimited nature of its objectives. He spoke as if the objective is the modest one of simply "making Hanoi behave." It became clear, however, that in his mind this phrase means the total defeat of the Vietcong and the establishment in South Vietnam of an anti-Communist government—which could only exist, as 10 years of experience shows, under a permanent protectorate of American military power.

If the administration shares this view of the objective, then it is seriously misleading the people in professing a desire for peace negotiations. The only possible basis for negotiations would be a willingness on both sides to accept a compromise that fell short of total victory for either.

According to reports of Secretary General U Thant's peace explorations, Hanoi's terms for negotiation may not be so extreme as they have been pictured. They are said to include a pause in the bombing, a halt to escalation of the ground fighting, and acceptance of the Vietcong as a party to negotiations. President de Gaulle, who has written Ho Chi Minh expressing willingness to participate actively in a settlement at the proper time, is said to feel that peace calls for a three-stage process—first, a cease-fire, then establishment of a broadly representative coalition government in South Vietnam, and finally a reconvened Geneva Conference to guarantee the neutrality of both South and North Vietnam.

There would be nothing dishonorable in a settlement along these lines, and American policy ought to be firmly pointed in this direction as the alternative to an unlimited military escalation with increasing risk of world war. Our true national interests can be better served by a neutralized southeast Asia than by a costly and misguided effort to establish a national military outpost on Asian soil.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in his annual report to the U.N. Economic and Social Council, Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, made several comments which should be of great interest to the Senate.

He said that the "really important issue" for the longer term in keeping the international payments system functioning smoothly was "whether arrangements can be made to insure that the

maintenance of a balance in the U.S. international accounts will not have harmful effects on the world economy."

He recognized the close relationship between the U.S. payments deficit and international monetary reform by concluding that prospects for avoiding any harmful effects from achievement of a balance in the U.S. payments "will depend to a considerable extent on appropriate action to deal with the problem of international liquidity."

On commenting on the U.S. balance-of-payments program, he said that he preferred the "voluntary" restraints on private U.S. capital outflows to policies which would reduce the growth of the U.S. economy. He concluded:

Nevertheless, continuation over the long run of a comprehensive program to restrict the outflow of capital from the United States would not only represent a break with U.S. tradition, but would also not be in the best interests of the international community.

I hope that the administration will not ignore this warning. I hope that my colleagues will not dismiss it either. Mr. Schweitzer is one of the ablest international monetary experts in the world and is a distinguished civil servant. He is giving our country good counsel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "IMF Quota Increase Cleared," written by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., and published in the New York Times of Friday, February 25, 1966; and an address by Mr. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, delivered on February 24, 1966.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1966]

IMF QUOTA INCREASE CLEARED—25-PERCENT RISE ACCEPTED BY 59 NATIONS BUT DELAY IS SEEN—FUND'S CHIEF VOICES CONCERN ON U.S. PAYMENTS PLAN

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 24.—The International Monetary Fund announced today that the increase in members' quotas and drawing rights of 25 percent approved in September 1964, was now in effect.

The fund went "over the top" as enough members, with large enough quotas, made their subscriptions. So far, however, only 59 of the IMF's 103 members have accepted their larger quotas, with such major nations as West Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium yet to consent. No nation's quota can be increased without its consent.

There is no indication here that these countries will refuse to make their subscriptions. However, the present deadline of March 25 will probably have to be extended for another period of 6 months to give the members more time to complete internal formalities.

In a related development today, the Managing Director of the Monetary Fund, Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, said that "the really important issue" for the longer term in keeping the international payments system functioning smoothly was "whether arrangements can be made to insure that the maintenance of a balance in the U.S. international accounts will not have harmful effects on the world economy."

In giving his annual report on the IMF's activities to the United Nations Economic and Social Council in New York, Mr. Schweitzer said that prospects for avoiding any harmful effects from achievement of a balance in U.S. payments "will depend to a considerable extent on appropriate action to deal with the problem of international liquidity."

"Liquidity" is the term for the total of the nations' official financial reserves and access to credit, which amounts to the wherewithal for conducting world commerce. Reserves have been increased in recent years chiefly through the existence of the U.S. payments deficit.

Mr. Schweitzer said there was broad agreement on the need to expand world reserves, but he urged that any solution take account of the needs of the less-developed countries as well as those of the industrial nations.

Speaking of the U.S. efforts to solve its balance-of-payments problem, Mr. Schweitzer said:

"A solution * * * by restraints on the outflow of private capital is much to be preferred to alternative policies which could lead to a contraction of the U.S. economy and an ensuing reduction in import demand."

PERILS OF RESTRAINTS

"Furthermore, the effort being made by the U.S. authorities to prevent these restraints from causing injury to the developing countries, or other countries in relatively weak payments positions, is to be welcomed.

"Nevertheless, continuation over the longer run of a comprehensive program to restrict the outflow of capital from the United States would not only represent a break with U.S. tradition, but would also not be in the best interests of the international community."

When all the members of the fund accept the quota increase that became effective today, the total of all quotas will rise from \$16 to \$21 billion. Mr. Schweitzer said today that "it should not be long before this occurs."

TWO-THIRDS APPROVAL

The quota increase became effective because 59 members having together 67.8 percent of total quotas have made their subscription. The needed amount was two-thirds of total quotas.

The 59 include 11 of the 16 members that were granted increases of more than the 25 percent provided by the general formula. The five not included, all expected to subscribe soon, are West Germany, Canada, Greece, Norway, and the Philippines.

Mr. Schweitzer said that "the last 2 years have been the busiest in the fund's history." Outstanding drawings now are at the record level of \$4.3 billion and last year more countries, 23, drew on the fund than ever before.

ADDRESS BY THE MANAGING DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, MR. PIERRE-PAUL SCHWEITZER, BEFORE THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, FEBRUARY 24, 1966

This is the third year in which I have addressed the Economic and Social Council, and I should like to say how much I appreciate these opportunities to appear before you to discuss the many problems that we have in common. Looking back at world economic developments in recent years, I believe that we have cause for both dissatisfaction and encouragement. Acute poverty has persisted in many countries, along with hunger and even the fear of famine. The gap between rich and poor countries remains painfully wide, with the advance of the poorer countries proceeding too slowly, and often suffering grievous setbacks.

At the same time, there has been an unrivaled growth of world trade, a sustained and high level of economic activity in much of the world, and a solid strengthening of

international monetary cooperation. The continuation of economic growth at a substantial rate cannot be regarded as accidental. It is basically attributable to a set of policies and attitudes that have developed after World War II. In all countries high rates of employment and economic growth have become accepted as high-priority objectives. Their realization in individual countries has been facilitated by a refinement in methods of economic diagnosis and management. It has been helped also by intensive cooperation and consultation on questions of economic policy in a number of bodies under the auspices of the United Nations, in the Fund and the World Bank, and in other international organizations such as the GATT and the OECD.

The favorable developments have not been confined to the industrial countries. Indeed, growth rates in the developing countries have on the average about equaled those in the developed countries, and have been high by historical standards. However, much of the progress made by the developing countries in increasing national growth rates has been nullified by the rapid increase in their populations, and we are all acutely aware that hundreds of millions of the world's people still live under deplorable conditions. If we are to raise the standard of living of the developing countries to tolerable levels, it is an essential condition that an adequate growth rate be sustained in the highly industrialized areas of the world, and we therefore place great value on the advance made by the industrial countries. Only as this progress continues can a rising demand be insured for the export products of the developing countries and the maintenance of conditions under which a growing volume of development finance can reasonably be expected to become available. We should, at the same time, recognize that an adequate solution of the problems of the developing countries will not flow automatically from the growing affluence of a relatively few rich nations. This will require a sustained effort by all countries, over many decades. This is an effort to which international organizations must contribute their share, and it is one in which the Fund, in its own sphere, has been participating since its inception.

During the past year, developments in the world economy and international payments have been more satisfactory than seemed likely when I addressed the Council a year ago. First, in spite of some slowdown in several major countries, mainly in the first half of the year, high levels of employment have continued. Aggregate production in the industrial countries was substantially higher in 1965 than in 1964. Second, the decline in the rate of growth of international trade during the first half of the year was subsequently reversed. Third, although a weakening in prices for primary products reduced the rise in the export receipts of the primary producing countries in the first half of 1965, thereafter commodity prices became steadier and the export earnings of primary producing countries improved. Fourth, the sharp tensions in international payments which characterized late 1964 and early 1965 have eased considerably.

But I must also note the fact that the general expansionary trend in the world economy has increased the pressures on prices on a broad front. The problems of how to avoid and how to contain inflationary pressures are now again among the major challenges facing all industrial countries.

An acceleration in the pace of the U.S. economic advance in the second half of 1965 was a major factor underlying the greater strength shown by the world economy. For the first time in many years, the rate of growth in North America was markedly higher than in the other industrial areas. Both the United States and Canada were able to make considerable progress toward solv-

ing their problems of unemployment.

In the industrial countries in Western Europe and in Japan, expansion was much less vigorous, and industrial output rose only slowly until the fourth quarter of 1965. There was relative stability in the aggregate output of industrial countries outside North America in the earlier part of 1965 but this overall result reflected a combination of continued expansion in some countries, notably Germany, with relative slack in others. These latter included France, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom, where measures had been taken to combat inflationary pressures or to redress balance of payments positions. However, in some of the latter countries, mainly France and Italy, output has recently begun to expand more rapidly. Production in the industrial countries as a group now appears to be advancing at a more rapid rate than a year ago. This year, their output may hopefully be expected to rise by a little over 4 percent—about the same rate as that recorded from 1964 to 1965.

The temporary slowdown in the rise in world trade in the first half of last year affected the exports of the primary producing countries more than those of the manufacturing countries, whereas during the 1963-64 boom both had increased at about the same rate. The wider fluctuations in the export receipts from primary products can only partly be ascribed to the changes in demand in the industrial countries; supply conditions and structural factors appear to have been at least as important.

The fall in prices from 1964 to 1965 only slowed but did not halt the growth in the export earnings of the primary producing countries. Nevertheless the price movements adversely affected their balance-of-payments positions. The primary producing countries had been in general surplus in 1963 and 1964, but in 1965 the more advanced members of this group ran into aggregate deficit. Although the developing countries as a whole continued to be in moderate surplus through 1965, the true measure of the pressure on their payments positions was again masked by the maintenance of rigid controls.

When I addressed the Council a year ago, both of the major reserve currencies were under pressure. During the past year both of these currencies were strengthened. This happened in spite of the fact that two of the major industrial countries, France and Italy, were in substantial international surplus as a result of relatively slack domestic economies. An offsetting factor was that the balance of payments of Germany, where boom conditions existed throughout the year, swung from surplus into deficit. The continued expansion in Germany was the most important single factor, aside from the strong performance of the U.S. economy, in preventing the recessionary tendencies in certain countries during 1965 from spreading to wider areas. With ample reserves and a large volume of international transactions in relation to national income, Germany was well able to provide this expansionary impulse to the rest of the world. Germany's imports rose by 20 percent between 1964 and 1965, but its exports also rose and its deficit remained relatively moderate and its reserve position strong.

The most serious feature of the balance-of-payments problems of the United Kingdom in 1964-65 was the deficit on current account, although at the same time an increase in the net outflow of long-term capital made the position more difficult. Several corrective measures taken by the United Kingdom late in 1964, including a temporary surcharge on imports, were supplemented in 1965 and again more recently by the adoption of more restrictive financial and monetary policies and various restraints on the outflow of capital. These measures resulted in some improvement in the current balance

and a reduction in the net outflow of capital in the course of 1965. Toward the end of the year a considerable strengthening of sterling in exchange markets was in evidence.

The U.S. deficit, unlike that of the United Kingdom, has persisted over a number of years. It has gradually reduced U.S. reserves by about \$10 billion from the post-war high of \$26 billion in 1949. The drawing down of the U.S. gold stock and the substantial increase in dollar reserves held by other countries have brought into sharp focus the need for achieving a balance in the U.S. payments position.

The United States has had a long succession of large and, until last year, growing surpluses on current account. Its overall payments imbalance has been caused principally by large outflows of public funds and increased outflows of private capital, stemming in part from the dominant position that the United States holds in the world's capital markets. These outflows have been of great benefit to all the recipient countries—especially to the developing countries—and the need has been to achieve balance without unduly cutting off the world's access to U.S. capital. The U.S. program of voluntary restraint on the movement abroad of both short-term and long-term private capital has already been quite effective and, despite a decline in the current account surplus last year, the overall deficit has been reduced considerably.

Notwithstanding the reduction in the U.S. deficit, U.S. gold losses in 1965 were the largest in many years. This development is explained in part by large conversions of existing dollar balances into gold by some countries, mainly in the first half of the year, although these were partially offset by Canada's recent gold sales against U.S. dollars. Conversion of foreign exchange assets into gold during 1965 had the effect of destroying sizable amounts of international liquidity, and, in spite of considerable reserve creation through the International Monetary Fund, world reserves grew only slightly last year. This development is among the factors that have led to the recent intensifications of efforts to deal with the problem of international liquidity.

A solution to the U.S. balance-of-payments problem by restraints on the outflow of private capital is much to be preferred to alternative policies which could lead to a contraction of the U.S. economy and an ensuing reduction in import demand. Furthermore, the effort being made by the U.S. authorities to prevent these restraints from causing injury to the developing countries, or to other countries in relatively weak payments positions, is to be welcomed. Nevertheless, continuation over the longer run of a comprehensive program to restrict the outflow of capital from the United States would not only represent a break with U.S. tradition, but would also not be in the best interests of the international community.

In my judgment, the really important issue for the longer run is whether arrangements can be made to insure that the maintenance of a balance in the U.S. international accounts will not have harmful effects on the world economy. Prospects for avoiding these will depend to a considerable extent on appropriate action to deal with the problem of international liquidity. For many years, U.S. deficits have provided very large increases in the international reserves of other countries, and thereby have helped to maintain momentum in the growth of the world economy. Elimination of the U.S. deficit will dry up an important source of international liquidity. Without international action to create international reserves, this could well result in the adoption of contractionary or restrictive policies in other countries. This in turn could force the United States to take more severe measures

to protect its balance of payments, and the result could be a vicious circle.

The continuing inquiry into the question of the adequacy of international liquidity, methods of improving the processes for adjusting payments disequilibria, and possible improvements to the international monetary system, has been the principal preoccupation in international financial circles in recent months. Intensive studies of these matters are now being conducted in several bodies. I shall be saying more about these studies later. At this point, I should like to refer to the Fund's continuing role in this field.

One of the more important types of international liquidity is that provided by the Fund. As is well understood by our member countries, and, I am sure, by members of this Council, a part of a member's drawing facilities in the Fund is available on a virtually automatic basis. The remainder, and greater part, is available to members on certain conditions. These involve the maintenance or adoption by the member of satisfactory policies directed toward preventing or correcting the member's payments imbalances. The action which is now in process to increase members' quotas in the Fund is an important one. The Fund possesses the largest pool of credit resources available to countries for the financing of balance-of-payments deficits. These resources constitute a large potential supply of liquidity, available according to well-established principles, which many members have found to be of crucial importance.

I am, therefore, pleased to report that the executive board determined yesterday that countries having the required two-thirds of total quotas have consented to their quota increases, and these will therefore become effective within the next month. This brings into effect the quota increases approved by the Fund's Board of Governors last March, providing for a general increase of 25 percent in members' quotas, together with larger increases for 16 countries. It should not be long before, with further consents forthcoming, quotas in the Fund rise from the current level of about \$16 billion to about \$21 billion.

It is gratifying that this strengthening of the Fund's financial position should be in process just a few weeks before the 20th anniversary of the first meeting of the Fund's Board of Executive Directors. Twenty years ago Fund membership was 39, with total quotas amounting to \$7.4 billion. Now the Fund has 103 members and when all the pending quota increases are completed, total quotas will be nearly three times the 1946 level.

The agreement last September to renew the general arrangements to borrow for a second period of 4 years, from October 1966, is further evidence of the determination of the major industrial countries to work together in safeguarding the existing international monetary system. You may recall that under these borrowing arrangements, the governments or central banks of 10 industrial members have agreed to lend their currencies to the Fund, up to an aggregate amount of \$6 billion, if needed to forestall or cope with an impairment of the international monetary system. The arrangements have proved valuable, first in December 1964 and again in May 1965, in connection with large United Kingdom drawings on the Fund.

I should like not only to stress here the cooperative character of the agreement on Fund quota increases and the renewal of the general arrangements to borrow, but also to pay tribute to the central banks and monetary authorities who combined to make available an unprecedented volume of contingency financing to support the pound sterling in its recent period of weakness. Outside observers have recently been too impressed, in my view, by overpublicized differences among nations regarding the

future course of the international monetary system. It is true that these differences exist, but they should not be allowed to divert attention from the less dramatic but vital practical day-to-day cooperation among bankers and governments that has become an integral part of the present international monetary scene.

The past 2 years have been the busiest in the Fund's history. Total drawings rose to \$2 billion in 1964 and to \$2.4 billion in 1965. Last year 23 countries drew on the Fund—more than in any previous year. Since March 1947, when the Fund began operations, the cumulative total of all drawings has risen to \$11.5 billion, the number of countries that have used the Fund's resources has now reached 60—the majority being developing countries—and outstanding drawings, by 36 members, are at a record level of \$4.3 billion.

The magnitude of the financial demands on the Fund in the past 2 years has largely been a reflection of the payments difficulties encountered by the two main reserve centers, to the United Kingdom and the United States. It is the first time that these two countries have been simultaneously using the Fund's resources. Net drawings by the United Kingdom, at nearly \$2.4 billion, are the largest ever made by a single Fund member. U.S. drawings on the Fund, which began in February 1964, have also been extensive on a cumulative gross basis, amounting to a total of more than \$1 billion. However, during 1964 and 1965, U.S. dollars continued to be drawn from the Fund by other members, and outstanding U.S. drawings have been correspondingly reduced, and have remained always within the gold tranche. The current level of U.S. drawings—\$516 million—is about half the U.S. gold tranche.

But, as I have noted earlier, this does not imply any slackening in the use of the Fund's resources by developing countries. In 1965, the Fund approved new standby arrangements for 20 such countries, 9 in Latin America, 5 in Africa, and 6 in Asia, providing total drawing facilities amounting to \$646 million, of which \$250 million was still available to be drawn at the end of the year. The largest standby arrangement approved last year was a \$200 million arrangement for India, which was fully utilized during the course of the year to help sustain that country's sharply deteriorating exchange position. Other standby arrangements included a \$125 million arrangement with Brazil; a new arrangement in the same amount was approved earlier this month in support of that country's comprehensive efforts to overcome inflation. An \$80 million arrangement with Yugoslavia was approved in support of a broad program of exchange and economic reform. Drawings on the Fund in 1965—including drawings under the standby arrangements I have just enumerated—were made by more developing countries than in any previous year. A record number of these countries are currently using the Fund's resources, and their outstanding drawings are at an all-time high of \$1.4 billion.

In its transactions and consultations with members, the Fund has continued to be concerned with the high level of external indebtedness of some countries. Repayment commitments and servicing on short- and medium-term debts have now reached critical proportions for a number of members. Short-term borrowings, of course, are often entered into on the tacit understanding that they will be renewable at maturity, but even these obligations introduce a precarious element into a country's exchange budget. Moreover, the preemption of future exchange earnings for debt servicing and repayment can seriously reduce a country's capacity to import and can exert excessive pressure on exchange reserves. In extreme cases, such commitments raise doubts about a country's future creditworthiness and can result in the

denial of fresh resources from abroad, thus causing a disruption of the continuity of economic growth. Where appropriate, the Fund has assisted member countries in debt rescheduling negotiations with the countries to which they are indebted. It has, I believe, played a useful role as an impartial observer providing an assessment of the debtor country's position.

Useful as this work might be, the Fund has maintained that it is preferable to prevent the development of situations in which debt rescheduling is necessary. This is primarily a matter for enlightened action and constant watchfulness by creditor and debtor countries, but we believe that international institutions can make an appropriate contribution here also. The Fund is about to embark on a cooperative effort with the World Bank and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to improve the documentation on countries' indebtedness on short term as well as long term. This should help the Fund to assist countries more effectively within its field of operation, since, as is the case with many human ailments, an early diagnosis is the best way to prevent later complications.

At the request of many of our developing members, the Fund is at present closely examining the workings of its compensatory financing facility. This facility was established in 1963 with the aim of helping primary producing countries to meet short-term fluctuations in their export earnings largely attributable to circumstances beyond the control of the member concerned, by making available financial assistance over and above that already available from the Fund for general balance of payments support. Since its introduction, however, only three countries—Brazil, the Sudan, and the United Arab Republic—have made drawings under its provisions. This small demand on the facility has been due to the fact that, in the 3 years in which this facility has been available, export earnings by primary producing countries have been relatively favorable.

The facility operates by means of drawings repayable within the normal term for the Fund's financial assistance; that is, a maximum of 5 years. It is thus not intended to offer a solution to the problems associated with longer term declines in commodity prices, which would raise deeper economic issues, such as the provision of new resources or commodity arrangements, or the reorientation of economies. However, the Fund has received a number of suggestions for improving the facility within the context of the Fund's existing purposes and resources. We are at present carrying out a thorough and critical review of the Fund scheme as it has been operated so far, and are considering how it might best serve future needs. I am not able to say at this stage what our conclusions will be, but I believe that we shall come up with some constructive proposals to improve the facility's usefulness to Fund members.

The provision of short-term finance to members in temporary payments difficulties is of course one of the central purposes for which the Fund was established. It is intimately connected with the adequacy of international reserves, to which the Fund has given attention throughout the 20 years of its existence. As early as 1953, this Council requested and received a report from the Fund on this question. This was followed by a study entitled "International Reserves and Liquidity," published in 1958, which prepared the ground for a general increase of 50 percent in members' Fund quotas in 1959.

International liquidity, therefore, is not a new field of interest for the Fund, although it is a subject which has come increasingly to the fore in international financial discussions in recent years. This has developed particularly since the Fund's annual meeting of Governors in September 1963. The Fund's annual report for that year included

a comprehensive discussion of the liquidity question. Since then the Fund's 1964 and 1965 annual reports have contained extensive analysis of certain aspects of it.

A basic point underlying the present discussions is one I have mentioned earlier. If the United States balances its external accounts, as it is now in the process of doing, and if no counteraction is taken to insure an adequate supply of world liquidity, the future growth of world trade and payments would very likely be jeopardized.

I think it important to note that the growth of world reserves in 1965 was unusually low, and the postwar tendency for a relaxation of restrictions on trade and capital movements has been slowed down if not checked. In these circumstances it is widely recognized that it is not too early to try to reach an international consensus on two points: on the way the international monetary system should develop, and on possible new techniques for supplementing existing reserves that may be considered necessary. The Fund is intensifying its studies and discussions with this end in view. The group of 10 participants in the general arrangements to borrow are taking similar action, and they are expected to report on the progress of their deliberations later this year. The Fund has participated in this work of the group of 10 so that close contact has been maintained between the two deliberations. The staff of the Fund also assisted a special study group established by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD.

As a result of all these efforts, we have now progressed to the point where the liquidity problem is better understood, and there is broad agreement on the need to accelerate the search for a satisfactory solution to it. Among the issues to be determined are (1) What are the world's needs for reserves and prospects for their growth? (2) If a new reserve-creating mechanism is required, which countries should participate in that mechanism? and (3) On what basis will the reserves be distributed? These simple questions, however, are not conducive to simple answers. They involve complex technical, financial, economic, and political considerations.

It would be inappropriate for me to enter into the intricacies of these problems in my remarks today, but I should like to make a few observations of a nontechnical character. It is now generally agreed that the need for reserves is not limited to the more industrialized countries. I want to recall in this connection that the Fund has, from its very early years, urged the developing countries to increase their reserves, pointing out to them—in general and individual cases—the severity of the problems that arise if countries try to conduct their payments on the basis of inadequate reserves. As a matter of fact the developing countries as a group, excluding those few that happened to make unusual reserve gains during World War II, have increased their reserves by about 80 percent over the last decade, i.e., about in proportion to their trade.

Any scheme for reserve creation must, therefore, start out from the recognition of the legitimate reserve needs of developed and developing countries alike. Such a universal starting point does not necessarily mean that the provision of additional liquidity to all countries must be made in the same way. I do not preclude the possibility of approaches that are multiple in character and will yet be felt to be equitable all around and, therefore, fully acceptable. The process by which decisions on liquidity creation are taken must also in my opinion be one that properly reflects the widespread character of the problem. The experience of the Fund, in which all members can exercise their proper influence, shows that this can be arranged in ways which at the same time recognize the special position of certain countries.

The decisions that we are approaching refer not to the introduction of temporary improvisations but to basic further steps in the continuing evolution of the international monetary system. They will surely have a lasting influence on the future course of world economic developments, and thus on the economic position of each country. It is because of the international nature of the problem that I have urged the adoption of a truly international solution. To pursue any other course would, in my view, be a great disservice to the progress of international monetary cooperation.

Many of the issues now under consideration were faced by the participants of the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference at Bretton Woods in 1944, and were there settled to the general satisfaction with the creation of the International Monetary Fund. The decisions then taken were based on the enlightened understanding that all nations, large or small, were interdependent parts of the international economic system. It is on that understanding that we must continue to build.

THE EUROPEAN-ASIAN PARALLEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in a carefully argued article, Chalmers M. Roberts develops three points which I have stressed in my recent Vietnam speeches.

First, there is a genuine consensus in the United States on the need to stop the expansion by aggression and force of communism, but that the critics of the present policy of the administration in Vietnam resist drawing the conclusions which are inherent in their premise. This is, namely, that such expansion must be stopped in Asia as well as Europe.

Second, Roberts correctly argues that alliances in Asia may not be so unlike alliances in Europe if historical development is considered. When NATO was first created, it was strictly an American-British show. Only later did the Italian and French economies and political situation stabilize to allow them to make a contribution. Only in 1956 were the West Germans permitted to add their troops to the alliance. One cannot expect more from our Asian allies at this stage in their development than could have been expected from our European allies right after World War II.

Third, Roberts argues that the risk of direct Red Chinese intervention in Asia is no more likely than Russian intervention in Europe so long as their own interests and territory are not directly challenged. Specifically he doubts that Red China will send troops into Vietnam so long as the United States and Saigon do not attempt to occupy or overthrow the Government of North Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article by Chalmers M. Roberts which appeared in the Washington Post on February 27, 1966.

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

OLD POLICY IS NUB OF NEW DEBATE

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The great debate wracking the United States today over its role and course in Vietnam is but the latest manifestation of an old argument about the role in world affairs of this longtime isolationist Nation.

It was barely a quarter century ago that Franklin D. Roosevelt was roundly criticized

for seeming to suggest that the world should quarantine the aggressors, Hitler and Mussolini. In 1939, F.D.R. raised a storm by suggesting that America's frontier lay in France or along the Rhine.

In the wake of World War II, when the often uneasy American alliance with the Soviet Union was turning into a cold war, George Kennan wrote a magazine article enunciating a basic American policy, which came to be known as "containment."

Kennan, then head of the State Department's policy planning staff and later Ambassador to Russia and Yugoslavia, argued that there must be "a long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies." He said that because of the West's superior economic and military potential, it could and should apply counterforce at "a series of constantly shifting geographical and political points" corresponding to the shifts and maneuvers of Soviet policy.

Five months before the Kennan article appeared in print, the policy was in fact affirmed in the Truman doctrine. President Truman declared in an address to Congress on March 12, 1947, that "it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."

During the Eisenhower years, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles attempted to create, in the image of the NATO alliance for containing Soviet power in Europe, the CENTO and SEATO alliances in the Middle East and Asia. But both today are riddled with military weakness and political disagreement.

THE DEBATE'S ESSENCE

Today, the great debate, in essence, concerns whether Kennan's containment policy and Truman's doctrine have relevance to Asia, specifically to China and Chinese communism. China was not Communist-governed at the time Kennan wrote and even in the early years of Mao Tse-tung's control of the Chinese mainland many in the West viewed his realm as hardly more than a Moscow satrapy. The Sino-Soviet quarrel and the current Chinese verbal militancy have shattered that illusion in Moscow as well as in Washington.

As the American debate over Vietnam has progressed, many of the critics of President Johnson's policies have come at least to accept a basic relevance in Asia of the containment doctrine. Kennan himself told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "the policy of containment certainly has relevance to China, but it is a question of what and where and what lies within our resources. If we had been able to do better in Vietnam, I would have been delighted and I would have thought that the effort was warranted."

Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, wrote in the Washington Post last Sunday that "our present interests compel us to shape a workable foreign policy which will (1) contain Russia and China and (2) discourage the further spread of communism."

Columnist Walter Lippmann, like CHURCH a strong critic of the President, has written that "the containment of Red China today, like the containment of Stalinist Russia after the World War, is necessary to the peace of the world and is a vital interest of the United States."

In defense of the administration, Secretary of State Dean Rusk has declared, also to the Senate committee, that the Korean war was fought to sustain "the principle that the Communist world should not be permitted to expand" and Under Secretary of State George Ball has said that we are in Vietnam as "part of a continuing struggle to prevent the Communists from upsetting

the fragile balance of power through force or the threat of force."

THE BONES THEY PICK

To the President, Rusk, Ball, and administration supporters, the point seems obvious: we are trying to do no more and no less in Asia than we have done successfully in Europe. But to critics such as CHURCH, Lippmann, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, the Foreign Relations Committee chairman, and others, we have gone far beyond that to take on war which is not really relevant to containment of China and, in fact, may lead to a military conflict with China. In short, while such critics as these may not contest the principle, they deny its application in Vietnam.

What are the bones they pick with the Johnson policy?

They say the United States has no allies in Asia, as it has in Europe in the NATO Alliance. They perhaps forget, however, that West Germany, which now has the largest ground contingent in NATO, was not a member when the Alliance was created. They perhaps forget that the initial military power was almost totally American and British. And they perhaps forget that France and Italy were economically and politically chaotic with strong Communist parties. There was little democratic spirit in Germany in the early years after Hitler or in Italy after Mussolini. In short, the United States spent years in developing the Alliance both politically and militarily.

In southeast Asia, the United States has only rudimentary alliances by present European standards. Some allies back our stand in Vietnam; some do not; most worry about the consequences of our policy. Much of the future nature of the American posture in Asia, in terms of alliances to contain Chinese power, hinges on the outcome of the current military conflict.

ASIA VERSUS EUROPE

The critics also say there is a vast difference between Europe and Asia because most Americans share with the Western European allies a common culture and sense of democracy, whereas Asian culture is totally different and there is little democracy or even desire for it. In narrow fact, the charge is correct. But nations and peoples change, the interplay of East and West, of North and South, in today's jet age is immense in terms of ideas as well as economics. Or as Secretary Rusk has put it:

"There are people who speak of Asians as if they were strange creatures from another planet. Asia is a continent of many races and many cultures. But when you get down to fundamentals, Asians * * * want the same things we and other Western peoples want: a better life for themselves and their children, education, freedom from disease and terror and war. They know that in this age it is no longer necessary for men to live in misery."

Or as President Johnson remarked at Atlantic City shortly after attending the Honolulu conference:

"We cannot hold freedom less dear in Asia than in Europe or be less willing to sacrifice for men whose skin is a different color."

The United States has always been basically Europe-minded. Despite the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor which plunged us into World War II, we insisted as a matter of national policy on giving the war against Nazi Germany priority over the war against fascist Japan. But must it always be so?

Involved in this attitude of repulsion for affairs Asiatic surely is the matter of race: Americans and West Europeans are predominantly white, the Asians of a spectrum of colors. Furthermore, Europe's population and economic level are in our own range; Asia's numbers seem endless. To many, they are simply hordes of the poverty stricken and unwashed.

Many Americans have come to see beyond the cliches of Asian life, but many more find safety only in a Europe-mindedness for their internationalism. The real world compels American acceptance of Asia as a massive fact of life in a world grown increasingly interdependent.

LOVE-HATE SYNDROME

Toward the Chinese especially there is an American love-hate syndrome. Many Americans simply cannot forgive Chinese ingratitude for the good deeds of missionary days, nor accept the fact that we trampled on Chinese pride along with other Western powers.

A further view of the critics is that we do not know how, and perhaps never will learn how, to cope with guerrilla wars based in part on indigenous discontent with local social and economic conditions; that we oversimplify such uprisings into wars devilishly instigated by a nonexistent international Communist conspiracy.

In short, they argue that the United States strikes only a negative and sterile anti-Communist posture.

It is true that this often seems to be the case, and at times it has been the fact. The President's effort at Honolulu was designed to add the other dimension; to show that the United States cares about the positive aspirations of the Vietnamese as well as the negative aspects of Communist encroachment.

It was late in the game, it also is true, for such emphasis. And the administration can be faulted as well for a tendency to anti-Communist hyperbole, to which the critics have objected, in Lippmann's words, as "verbalism" instead of realism and "amateurism" instead of professionalism.

There is another factor, too, which is too much overlooked: the changing nature of Communist tactics. We tended to view the Korean conflict in terms of World War II, and thus many were repelled by our self-imposed limitations in contradistinction to Gen. Douglas MacArthur's view that "in war there is no substitute for victory."

HARKING BACK

Now, in Vietnam, the tendency is to think back to Korea and lament the absence of a battle line on a daily map to show how we are doing in order to make evident some limit to our military ambitions. It has been the Communist choice to obfuscate the situation by using guerrilla tactics without Chinese participation, just as in Korea it was their choice to fight a limited war without Soviet participation.

The United States has finally evolved new military tactics to cope with a new military situation; but our political evolution has not kept pace. We find it difficult to accept this type of war as simply another change in Communist strategy for countering American power and efforts at containment. We could and did adjust to Stalin's blockade gambit over Berlin. Why should it be so difficult to adjust to a guerrilla war?

Finally, the critics contend that whereas containment in Europe was designed to say to the Soviets that we would not permit any further expansion of Russian power by means of the Red Army, the situation in Vietnam is different because it represents no effort at expansion of Chinese power by means of the Chinese Army. Here, again, we balk at accepting a differing technique to obtain similar if not identical ends.

On occasion, imperial China extended its direct military sway; more often it used the just as effective technique of creating tributary states bound to it by fear and fealty. Communist China doubtless would employ this latter procedure throughout Asia were it not for the intervention of American power.

The Eastern European nations initially were true satellites of Moscow, but they have

evolved to a degree of independence; yet on key issues they remain, with the exceptions of Yugoslavia and Albania, basically subservient to the Soviet Union—and all are Communist states. China's aim in Asia is simply another form of such tributary states. In Vietnam, Peiping wants a totally Communist neighbor.

THE KOREAN FEAR

Finally, on the American fear of another Korea, meaning a repetition in Vietnam of the Chinese intervention by hundreds of thousands of volunteers, historians now agree that China sent its troops into Korea to fight the United States and its United Nations allies only when it felt its own security was threatened and that its neighboring Communist regime, North Korea, was in danger of extinction because of the military push to the Yalu River boundary with China.

In the Vietnamese conflict, President Johnson has given every assurance that there is no such threat to China; he has said we do not seek to destroy the regime in Hanoi nor covet its territory, despite the bombings of North Vietnam. There is no sign of any intention to invade North Vietnam, as North Korea was invaded, and of carrying the land war to the Chinese frontier.

Fundamentally, then, the United States is involved in Vietnam, whatever the arguments over how it all began, to contain Chinese expansionism; that is, to contain the advance of Chinese power by the use of force, either Chinese force or that of a proxy. The North Vietnamese and their instrumentality, the Vietcong, are attempting to advance Communist power, just as the North Koreans attempted to advance Communist power.

The North Vietnamese are hostile to the Chinese, Communist or not, and there is hope that Ho Chi Minh can become the Tito of Asian communism, but this does not change the fact that China is attempting to use him to expand the realm of Asian communism, beholden in a tributary sense to Peiping.

The question for Americans is whether they recognize the essential fact: that to permit an alteration in the size and shape of the Communist orbit, however faction-ridden it is and despite degrees of internal independence, is to alter the balance of power. It also would encourage Peiping, as the center of Asian communism, to believe that success in Vietnam can lead to similar successes elsewhere—to the detriment of American power and prestige as well as to the peace of the world.

RESOLUTIONS PERTAINING TO PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT IN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain resolutions relative to purchase of surplus or used equipment in New York State may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 107, 1966

(By Suffolk County Board of Supervisors, resolution relative to purchase of surplus or used equipment)

Whereas counties and towns of New York State frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be for a limited time, and surplus machinery and equipment, or used machinery and equipment, would be adequate, and the ability of a county or town to purchase such machinery and equipment at reduced prices would result in considerable saving to taxpayers; and

Whereas the State Finance Law permits the Office of General Services to sell surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment; and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers, who then offer much of such machinery for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment, and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of such particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

Whereas it is the consensus of this board that such surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Suffolk hereby urges the State legislature to pass legislation to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment for sale, to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, with prices established for the items, that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village, that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the prices indicated on the inventory, and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities of the United States to purchase surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the senators and assemblymen representing Suffolk County in the State legislature and the U.S. Congressmen and the U.S. Senators representing the people of Suffolk County, and all other county boards of supervisors of the State of New York, to the Supervisors Association, the Association of Towns, the County Officers Association, the County Superintendent of Highways Association, and the Town Highway Superintendents Association. Dated: February 14, 1966.

Approved:

H. LEE DENNISON,
County Executive of Suffolk County.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY,
Buffalo, N.Y., February 16, 1966.

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the county hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 15th day of February A.D. 1966, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Erie hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities

to purchase surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public."

Attest:

WALTER A. HOLZ,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
of Erie County.

RESOLUTION 17—PURCHASE OF STATE SURPLUS
OR USED EQUIPMENT BY MUNICIPALITIES
(By Ways and Means and Finance
Committees)

Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment the use of which will be for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment or used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers; and

Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Allegany hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities to purchase surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Supervisors' Association, Association of Towns, the County Officers Association, County Superintendent of Highways Association, Town Highway Superintendents' Association, all members of the New York State Legislature and the U.S. Congress representing Allegany County, Governor of the State of New York and all other county boards of supervisors of the State of New York.

MANLEY C. ACKERMAN,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors,
Allegany County.

RESOLUTION 27, 1966

(Resolution relating to purchase of surplus or used equipment by Mr. Storie)

"Whereas counties and towns of New York State frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be for a limited time, and surplus machinery and equipment, or used machinery and equipment, would be adequate,

and the ability of a county or town to purchase such machinery and equipment at reduced prices would result in considerable saving to taxpayers; and,

"Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment; and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers, who then offer much of such machinery for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

"Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment, and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of such particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of this board that such surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of St. Lawrence hereby urges the State legislature to pass legislation to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment for sale, to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, with prices established for the items, that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village, that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the prices indicated on the inventory, and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities of the United States to purchase surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to Senator Stafford, Assemblyman Ingram, Congressman McEWEN, Senator JAVITS, and Senator KENNEDY."

On a motion by Mr. Storie, seconded by Mr. Miller, the resolution was unanimously adopted.

I, Charles V. Fox, clerk of the St. Lawrence County Board of Supervisors, do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the resolution unanimously adopted by the St. Lawrence County Board of Supervisors on February 14, 1966.

CHARLES V. FOX,
Clerk, St. Lawrence County Board
of Supervisors.

RESOLUTION 29, 1966

Resolution objecting to sec. 53 of the conservation law, by Mr. Storie

"Whereas section 53 of the conservation law of the State of New York compels counties in the Adirondack preserve to pay one-half the cost of fighting forest fires; and

"Whereas the claims arise from expenses incurred by the State conservation department in fighting forest fires; and

"Whereas the State conservation department had complete control over the expenditures and do hire men and equipment, including an airplane and bulldozers; and

"Whereas some of this equipment is hired merely to stand by in case of need; and

"Whereas counties have no control or supervision over the expenditures; and

"Whereas the counties in the Adirondack preserve have no control over the closing of the woods during the drought season; and

"Whereas such a statute that compels the small counties in the Adirondack Forest Pre-

serve to pay this expense is unjust and unfair to the taxpayers of these counties; and

"Whereas the users of the woods pay a license fee to the State of New York and the woods are used by residents from all over the State, as well as nonresidents of the State; and

"Whereas this type of expenditure causes a terrific financial injustice to the taxpayers of the small counties in which the fires happen to occur: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the county of St. Lawrence do hereby protest and do hereby object to this unfair law which is a statute; and be it further

Resolved, That the New York State Senate and Assembly hereby consider amending or changing the existing law so as to eliminate this expense of fighting forest fires to an individual county; and be it further

Resolved, That the said board of supervisors do hereby request the State senator and State assemblyman from this district to introduce legislation to change the law in relation to the counties bearing half of the cost of fighting forest fires in their respective counties."

On a motion by Mr. Storie, seconded by Mr. Dixon and Mr. Slate, the resolution was unanimously adopted.

I, Charles V. Fox, clerk of the St. Lawrence County Board of Supervisors, do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of St. Lawrence County on February 14, 1966.

CHARLES V. FOX,
Clerk, St. Lawrence County Board of Supervisors.

STEBEN COUNTY RESOLUTION

Resolution urging legislation in regard to purchase by municipalities of surplus or used equipment, upon the recommendation of the highway committee and the insurance and laws committee

Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be used for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment or used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers; and

Whereas, the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete or unused machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Steuben hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any

items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities to purchase surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment, at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board of supervisors is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to Senator William T. Smith, to Assemblyman Charles D. Henderson, to Congressman CHARLES GOODELL, to Senator JACOB JAVITS and to Senator ROBERT KENNEDY.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR McNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I have heard of the pending retirement from the Senate of Senator PAT McNAMARA, of Michigan, on grounds of ill health.

I have never known a more honorable, candid, or forthright man. Senator McNAMARA speaks his mind without guile or craft and votes his convictions without fear or favor.

He is like the Rock of Gibraltar—a tower of integrity. He is also a brave and uncomplaining man. The Senate is the better for his service, and so is the country.

We shall miss him, and so will the Nation.

REDUCTION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF THE VERMONT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution of the Vermont State Board of Education under date of February 23, 1966, in opposition to the reduction of the appropriation for the special school milk program for fiscal 1966 and the reduction in the President's budget for fiscal 1967 in the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE VERMONT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

The Vermont State Board of Education at its regular meeting, February 11, 1966, unanimously voted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Federal Bureau of the Budget has reduced the appropriation for the special milk program for fiscal 1966; and

"Whereas the President's budget for fiscal 1967 proposes drastic cuts in the appropriations for school lunch and special milk programs, and

"Whereas the Vermont State Board of Education unanimously feels that both the school lunch and special milk programs are vital to the children of America and hence to the future of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Vermont State Board of Education opposes any reduction in the appropriations for these programs; and

"That the Vermont State Board of Education believes that Federal appropriations for these programs should be increased, commensurate with the growth of both programs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Vermont delegation in the

Congress and the Office of the President of the United States."

RICHARD A. GIBBONEY,
Commissioner of Education and Secretary to the State Board of Education.

THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA CUTS THE GRANTS FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGES SUCH AS THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a source of pride to all Alaskans is the University of Alaska located at College, Alaska, a few miles west of downtown Fairbanks. The university dates from 1915, when the U.S. Congress set aside land for the support of an agricultural college and school of mines. This land-grant college opened for instruction in 1922 under the presidency of Charles E. Bunnell, previously a Federal judge. It was a small school, and remained so in the years before the war, but performed a unique task then, as it does today, for it is the only institution of higher learning in the United States that serves, within the scope of its resources, all of public educational needs, beyond high school, of an entire State. It became the University of Alaska in 1935 by action of the territorial legislature.

In number of students, as compared to other universities in the United States, the University of Alaska is a small but rapidly growing institution. Apart from the main campus, it operates six community colleges in cities throughout the State, and in four of those communities, it offers the only education programs above the high school level. In terms of activities in research and advanced study, it is burgeoning—its institute of arctic biology, its geophysical institute, the arctic research laboratory, are making valuable contributions to the advancement of knowledge of our planet.

The 1967 Federal budget, which purported to allow both guns and "the high priced spread" would sharply curtail these activities. The new budget would eliminate \$39,276 in the Alaska Agriculture Experiment Station funds for research conducted jointly by the University and the Department of Agriculture. This cut, coupled with the budget's failure to provide funds for continued agriculture research in Alaska, amounting to \$400,000 last year, will force the experiment station in Palmer to close. This station has developed a potato that can compete favorably with imported potatoes—those locally grown had a high water content attributed to the extensive hours of growth under the long daylight of northern latitudes. Also just announced by the Palmer station is a new variety of grass that will be of utmost importance to our dairy industry. It is vitally important that we in Alaska develop other products, for we are almost solely dependent upon air freight for the greater share of our fresh vegetables. Unless these funds are restored—if we are forced to close our research station, our harvest in many years to come will suffer, this is but another of the bitter fruits produced by the war in southeast Asia and nurtured by the ever-increasing escalation of our military efforts there.

Equally tragic is the drastic cutback in funds for instruction and facilities in land grant institutions. Here the University of Alaska is losing over \$230,000. This means that if the average salary of an instructor in Alaska is \$10,000, we will lose 23 instructors. Some programs will have to be eliminated. Others may of necessity be cut back or held at their present levels.

In a State that is noted for its richness in natural resources. Yet we consider our most important natural resource an educated populace. If we must sacrifice something to bear the burden of the wholly unnecessary undeclared war in Vietnam let the sacrifice be made in other areas that we can more readily afford—not in the education of our youth. They will be sacrificed both at home and abroad by the southeast Asian folly. These funds should be restored.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE—REFORM OR RETREAT?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this morning the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary opened hearings on the question of reforming the electoral college. It was my privilege to present testimony today in behalf of my proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 12.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD my testimony before the committee in behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 12, which is cosponsored by Senators STROM THURMOND, Republican, of South Carolina; JOHN McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas; ROMAN HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska; THRUSTON MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky; PETER DOMINICK, Republican, of Colorado; HIRAM FONG, Republican, of Hawaii; J. CALEB BOGGS, Republican, of Delaware; JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi; and WINSTON PROUTY, Republican, of Vermont to provide for the election of presidential electors by the district system.

There being no objection, the testimony of Senator MUNDT was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear before this subcommittee on the question of electoral college reform. This is an issue with which I have been closely associated since 1953 when I joined with former Representative Frederic R. Coudert, of New York, in introducing legislation which would elect presidential electors from districts within a State rather than from a State as a whole.

Such a plan did not originate with us, although it has been popularly called the Mundt-Coudert plan, for it was in fact originally advocated by such early and mightier statesmen as James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, and John Quincy Adams.

I point this out to emphasize that the need for such a plan has always existed although it has never been formally adopted. At least it has never been adopted on a national basis which would be the only fair way of utilizing such a procedure. I believe that today the need is even greater than it has been in the past.

As the result of Supreme Court decisions in *Baker v. Carr*, and of particular significance to the question of electoral districts, *Wesberry v. Sanders*, a profound change has occurred in our system of representation—a change that has provided us with both the

increased need for equalization within our presidential electoral process and the vehicle to achieve that equalization.

Mr. Chairman, at a later point I will go into this matter of *Wesberry v. Sanders* and the subsequent redistricting of congressional districts so that they will be as equal in population as practical in more detail. I will also cover the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 12; much of what I will say has been said before—the last time in 1961 before this same subcommittee. I note, however, that very few of the same members are present as the certainties of time and the uncertainties of elections have taken their toll.

For the present, let me say that I agree with James MacGregor Burns who has written: "Most Americans, regardless of party, are agreed on the failings of the electoral college. It is unfair, inaccurate, uncertain, and undemocratic. Unfair, because the presidential candidate losing a State by even a close margin forfeits all of that State's electoral votes. Inaccurate, because in most elections the winner's electoral votes are inflated grotesquely out of proportion to his popular vote. Uncertain, because presidential electors are not legally bound to vote for the candidate who carries the State. And undemocratic, because if no candidate wins a majority of the electoral college the verdict is rendered in the House of Representatives, where each State delegation, no matter how large, casts but a single vote in choosing among the three top candidates."

Senate Joint Resolution 12, in my estimation, is the only plan proposed which would correct these inequities without making basic changes in our constitutional system. It would correct the unfairness by eliminating the general ticket system. It would correct the inaccuracy because it would bring the electoral vote in line with the popular vote. It would correct the uncertainty because it would bind the presidential electors to the winning candidate. It would correct the undemocratic factors because it provides for a greater voice for the larger States should Congress be forced to name the President in the event no candidate wins a majority of the electoral college.

I stress this totality of correction for I believe that the amending process of the Constitution should never be used to confirm error; it should only be used to correct it and now that we have an opportunity to reexamine the electoral process for the President of the United States we should do a thorough job of it and get to the real root of the problem which is the general ticket system. This is not to say that I do not agree with some of the proposals advanced by President Johnson or that none of them are desirable. On the contrary, Senate Joint Resolution 12 includes some of them, and could be modified, I believe, to include others. The real problem, however, is not the fact that the electors are not bound to follow the will of the majority—a situation that has occurred only 8 out of a possible 14,554 times since 1820, or that certain gaps exist should the election be thrown into the House of Representatives—a situation that hasn't occurred since 1824 and has only happened twice in the history of our Nation. The real problem is the inequality of the voting power of the citizens of the various States—a situation which occurs every 4 years.

This is the main theme of my proposal and it can be summed up in one sentence:

I believe, and I hope you believe, and think you believe that every voter in this country as an individual, whether he lives in California, Delaware, New York, or South Dakota, ought to have equal voting power when it comes to electing the President of the United States.

This is the only important respect in which our electoral college system, so-called, has

failed to function with fairness. It has stood the practical test of time since our country was established. It has carried us through 45 presidential elections, through peace and war, from George Washington to Lyndon B. Johnson. It was after the 4th presidential election that the 12th amendment was added to the Constitution to require presidential electors to vote specifically for President and Vice President, rather than, as the original provision provided, for two persons for President. Since then, 40 presidential elections have been held. It is obvious, therefore, that any system that has functioned so well for so long should not be changed lightly. Changes proposed or made should be the absolute minimum required to bring about the desired and necessary results.

Such minimum and wholly practical and necessary changes are proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12, which I am sponsoring together with Senators THURMOND, McCLELLAN, HRUSKA, MORTON, DOMINICK, FONG, BOGGS, STENNIS, and PROUTY. This is a slightly revised version of the original Mundt-Coudert amendment, with which most of us are familiar.

Our Founding Fathers, in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, gave long and careful consideration to the method of electing the President. At first it decided he should be elected by the Congress. Then it changed its collective mind and transferred the power of choice to an electoral college that was to be an exact counterpart of the Congress with the representation of the States as units, corresponding to the Senators, as well as population of the States, corresponding to Representatives, and which should meet at the seat of government.

Upon further consideration this plan was dropped because of the fear that the electors wouldn't travel so far for a single purpose. It took days in those times to cover distances that we span in a few hours. The Convention went back to its original idea that a President be elected by a joint session of Congress. They did this with reluctance because it ran counter to their strong beliefs in the principle of separation of powers of the executive and legislative branches of the new Government.

At this point the idea developed that the electors could meet and cast their votes in their own States and transmit the certificates of their ballots to the seat of government.

Accordingly, the work of electing the President was divided. The Convention transferred the act of voting from a joint session of Congress to electoral colleges in the several States, the results to be transmitted to the President of the Senate. It left with Congress, in joint session, the function of counting the certified results from the States, as would have been the case had Congress done the voting.

This plan appears in article II, section 1 of the Constitution—a part of which has been superseded by the 12th amendment:

"Each State shall appoint in such a manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector."

The exclusion of Members of Congress and Federal officeholders is required by the cardinal principle of separation of powers.

In Senate Joint Resolution 12, the clause, "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct," is eliminated. In its stead, Senate Joint Resolution 12 requires:

"The electors to which a State is entitled by virtue of its Senators shall be elected by the people thereof, and the electors to which it is entitled by virtue of its Representatives shall be elected by the people within single-electoral districts established by the legisla-

ture thereof; such districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory, containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitled the State to one Representative in the Congress; and such districts when formed shall not be altered until another census has been taken. Before being chosen elector, each candidate for the office shall officially declare the persons for whom he will vote for President and Vice President, which declaration shall be binding on any successor. In choosing electors of President and Vice President the voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, except that the legislature of any State may prescribe lesser qualifications with respect to residence therein."

It is the clause, "In such manner as the legislature thereof may direct," that is the root of the present problem. Only 10 States participated in the election of our first President, George Washington. North Carolina and Rhode Island had not yet ratified the Constitution; and New York's two houses of the legislature could not agree on who the electors should be.

No uniform method of choosing electors was followed. Electors were chosen in a variety of ways: election by legislatures, election by the people in districts, and election by the people on a general ticket which means that each voter in the State could vote for every one of the State's electors. In Massachusetts, each of the eight districts chose two electors from which the legislature selected one per district and added two electors at large.

In the succeeding presidential elections through 1832, the various methods were used with States changing from one to the other. In 1836, the general ticket system was used in every State but South Carolina, which continued to elect by the legislature through 1860.

After Washington's two elections, the Presidency was contested every 4 years on a party basis as it is today. The majority party in each State was quick to see the advantage of consolidating its electoral strength either through legislature selection or through use of the general ticket system so as to exert maximum influence in electing a President. Federalists did this where they were in control in the New England States, for example, and the anti-Federalists, later Jefferson's Republicans, did the same thing in their States.

Since 1836, with the exception of South Carolina, there have been only three instances of departures from the general ticket system, the one we now employ. They were Florida in 1868 and Colorado in 1876, in which the elections were by the legislature, and Michigan in 1892, when the district system with two electors at large was used.

It is extremely doubtful if any voter living today has used anything but a general ticket system in presidential elections. This use of the general ticket system in every State is largely responsible for many of the misunderstandings of the electoral college system which exist today and for much of the notion that the electors are archaic and unnecessary.

When we regard the electoral college as the exact numerical counterpart of Congress we can see readily that it combines the two principles of representation in our Federal Union of States. We have the Federal principle of equal representation of the States in the Senate regardless of population, and, then, we have the national principle of unequal representation of the States in the House of Representatives based on their unequal populations. State representation in the House in the present Congress ranges from 1 to 41.

Each citizen of each State is represented in the Senate by two Senators and in the

House of Representatives by one Representative, with a few exceptions. His representation in Congress, therefore, is two parts Federal and one part national. In the electoral college, with the general ticket system in force in every State, there is no equality of citizen representation. It ranges from a high of 43 members of the electoral college for a citizen of New York—to 3 for a citizen of each of the 5 States that sent only 1 Representative to the present Congress.

Conversely, each citizen has as many votes in presidential elections as his State has members in the electoral college, because they are elected on a general ticket. In other words, when a New York voter pulls a voting machine lever for a presidential ticket, he is actually casting 43 votes, 1 for each of 43 electors on a party slate.

On the other hand, the citizens of the five States which have only one Member of the House of Representatives have only three votes each in the presidential election. In my own State of South Dakota, each citizen has four votes.

This tremendous disparity in voting weight between the individual citizens of the large States and the small States is the true source of all the valid complaints which have been made against the electoral college system. The real culprit is the use of the general ticket by every State. Of course, each State legislature could abandon the general ticket, but none will without certain knowledge that all other States will abandon it at the same time. To do so as an individual State, acting alone, would of course be to sharply lessen its influence in the selection of a President. This is why a constitutional amendment is necessary to bring about a change.

Mr. Chairman, there is no more justification for choosing electors on a general ticket than there is for electing a State's delegation to the House of Representatives, counterparts of electors, on a statewide bloc basis, which is what the general ticket does. All of us remember the consternation on the part of both the Congress and the people, following the *Wesberry v. Sanders* decision, when it appeared as though some States might have to elect all of their Representatives at large if they did not redistrict.

The people in particular were outraged at the thought that their district's Representative was to be taken from them and given to the entire State. And yet it would be just as fair to use the general ticket for Representatives as it is to use it for their counterparts in the electoral college.

I submit that the number of persons which entitled a State to one Representative in the Congress should entitle the same group of people to one member of the electoral college.

What have been the effects of the general ticket system of choosing electors? I suggest these:

1. It excludes from the Office of President of the United States all men, no matter how able and outstanding they may be, unless they come from a State with a large bloc of electoral votes.

2. By the same token, the dominant forces in the large, pivotal States which are responsible for the nomination and election of our Presidents have inordinate influences at the White House and in the executive branch of our Government.

3. It invites fraud in the large States that are crucial and where the vote is expected to be close. The effect of such vote fraud is statewide under the general ticket. A fraudulent vote, undetected, counts just as much as a valid vote in the statewide total. This invitation to fraud in key or pivotal States works hand in hand with another evil of our political system—the large campaign contributions that gravitate to the big cities in the heavily populated States. Where the

stake is some 40 electoral votes, which is just over one-sixth of the number necessary to elect a President, the temptation to make sure that the money achieves its objectives is alarmingly strong.

By utilizing the district system, if fraud would still prevail, it could influence simply the electors coming from that specific electoral district. It would, therefore, minimize the impact of fraud and, consequently, tend to minimize the importance of anybody coming forth. At worst, fraud or corruption in any specific area or election constituency could influence only 3 electoral votes not 36 or 40 as can now occur.

4. Although the Constitution gives each State the same numerical representation in the electoral college that it has in the two Houses of Congress by using the general ticket for electors, we have formed a constituency for the President which is altogether different from that which elects the Congress. The great difference between these two constituencies is that almost all Representatives are elected in single member districts while their counterparts in the electoral college are elected in multimember districts consisting of entire States. This situation permits voters of a State, voting straight party tickets, to produce one result in the electoral college and an altogether different result in the House of Representatives at the same election. The effect of all this is that we have what I have called a "presidential United States" and a "congressional United States" that are, politically speaking, two different countries within one national boundary.

I would like at this time to turn to the question of the districts themselves but first I believe a little background information is in order. As originally introduced several years ago, the Mundt-Coudert amendment provided that a State's electors corresponding to its Representatives in Congress should be elected from congressional districts and the two corresponding to its Senators should be elected statewide, as Senators are elected. Critics, most of them supporters of the status quo, objected strongly and with justice that the use of congressional districts was open to criticism since in some States districts were nowhere near being equal in population and district lines had been unfairly drawn by whatever political party controlled the State legislature, a practice long known as gerrymandering.

To meet this criticism the amendment was redrawn to provide for the establishment of electoral districts to be composed of "compact and contiguous territory, containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitled the States to one Representative in the Congress."

Such language was, I believe, considered fair and acceptable by those who had earlier harbored some reservations as to the district system. Subsequently, however, doubts were raised as to the enforceability of this provision. From a practical viewpoint they questioned whether Congress would exercise the power granted to it to refuse to count the electoral votes not chosen in compact and contiguous districts.

Of far greater importance was the question of judicial enforcement. The last hearings were held during the months of May, June, and July of 1961. At that time serious doubts existed as to whether the judicial branch could or should accept jurisdiction of a case alleging malapportionment. The legal precedents on judicial enforcement of districting standards were not clear and, although I felt then that by placing the provision in the U.S. Constitution we had overcome this hurdle, I would be willing to admit that many individuals, both among my colleagues and in the academic circles, had reasonable grounds to question the effectiveness of the recourse to legal enforcement even though

they by this time believed that the revised district system was a fair and acceptable method of reforming the electoral college.

When in the summer of 1961 this committee mulled over the problem of enforceability events were already taking place in the judicial branch of the Government which would have a profound impact on this question and indeed our entire system of Government. On March 26, 1962, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its historic decision in *Baker v. Carr*. It is not necessary at this time to go into the background of this case for I am sure that we are all familiar with it. The result, however, is important for the Court held that legislative apportionment problems were within the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, that a justiciable cause of action exists and that a voter within a district that is allegedly malapportioned has standing in court to challenge such an arrangement.

In the wake of its *Baker v. Carr* opinion the Court has handed down additional decisions spelling out further what has come to be known as the "one man, one vote" principle. In certain aspects that relate to the right of the majority of the people to choose their own course and system of government I find myself in disagreement with the Court, but that is not important for the purpose of today's discussion. What is important is that the judicial branch has very clearly and vigorously indicated that they not only can but will enforce the districting standards.

One of these subsequent decisions, and from a practical viewpoint the one that has had the greatest impact on the district plan of electoral college reform, was the aforementioned *Wesberry v. Sanders* which was rendered on February 17, 1964. Not only was this the first instance in which the Court applied the "one man, one vote" principle on a nationwide basis but the objects of their directive were the congressional districts rather than State legislative districts. Admittedly, the Court based its decision on the history and wording of article I, section 2 of the Constitution which refers only to the makeup of the House of Representatives rather than on the 14th amendment but the Supreme Court rested on the findings of the *Baker* case to show that districting cases were justiciable.

As the result of *Wesberry* great strides have been made over the past 2 years toward bringing congressional districts into line with "one man, one vote" standards. Redistricting has been completed by the legislatures of 21 States and significantly has been brought about by the courts in three instances—Arizona, Illinois, and Montana.

Using the 15 percent deviation standard only 52 Congressmen in 14 States at the present time could be considered from districts that are either over- or underrepresented and in some of those States efforts are currently underway to redistrict.

In addition mention should be made of H.R. 5505 which has already passed the House of Representatives and as you know is currently being considered by your parent committee. Because this legislation is before your committee, I do not feel that it would be appropriate to dwell on it at length. For the record, however, I would like to point out that this bill as passed by the House would establish minimum standards for its districts. The House-passed version would include the 15-percent deviation standard and includes language regarding compactness and contiguity similar to Senate Joint Resolution 12. It would also prohibit at-large districts when a State has more than one Representative. I understand that some of these provisions are being questioned by your committee.

I have mentioned both the progress made in redistricting as a result of *Wesberry* and H.R. 5505 because it would appear that the machinery is being developed which would

enable the Mundt-Courdet plan to evolve back to its original proposal, which was the election in congressional districts of those electors corresponding to the State's Representatives in Congress. The establishment of House of Representatives districts that are nearly equal in population and meet the requirements of anti-gerrymandering would make it unnecessary, I assume, to establish separate districts for the electoral process.

For the time being no changes have been made in the wording of Senate Joint Resolution 12 regarding the utilization of existing congressional districts but I am sure that this would be a relatively simple matter to accomplish should such a change be deemed appropriate. Under existing court decisions and the present statutes, however, there is no requirement that Congressmen be elected in districts. Two States having two or more Representatives—Hawaii and New Mexico—elect their Representatives at large and this must be taken into consideration.

In summing up this particular part of my testimony I would like to emphasize these points:

1. Electoral districts that are as equal in population as practical appear to present no problem. The States themselves are moving rapidly in this direction and the courts have shown no hesitancy in enforcing population standards.

2. Electoral districts that are compact and contiguous could be enforced, if need be, through the courts by various means.

- (a) Passage of H.R. 5505 may require all House of Representative districts to meet these standards, a provision enforceable by the courts, and thus the existing congressional districts could be utilized.

- (b) Existing constitutional provisions may already provide the Court with authority to act.

- (c) With the constitutional amendment provided by Senate Joint Resolution 12 additional and explicit authority would be provided for the enforcement of this provision, strong legal precedents already existing for the assumption of jurisdiction by the Federal courts.

There is another often-raised objection to the present system of electing a President. President Johnson in his message to the Congress commented upon it and requested that it be corrected. It is the provision that if no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes when they are counted in Congress that the House of Representatives shall choose immediately a President from among the candidates with the three highest numbers of electoral votes. The vote in such a case—the last time it occurred was in 1824—is by State; each State delegation having one vote. In the event a State's House delegation is evenly divided its vote is not recorded. A majority of the States is required for election.

The objection to this system is that it is grossly unfair to the larger States, giving New York, California, and Pennsylvania no greater voice than Alaska, Delaware, and Nevada despite the great population disparities.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 corrects this situation. It provides that in the event no presidential candidate has a majority of the electoral vote that "then from the persons having the three highest numbers on the list of persons voted for as President, the Senate and the House of Representatives, assembled and voting as individual members of one body, shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President; a quorum for such purpose shall be three-fourths of the whole number of Senators and Representatives, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary for a choice; if additional ballots be necessary, the choice on the fifth ballot shall be between the two persons having the highest number of votes on the fourth ballot."

The Constitution also provides that if no candidate for Vice President has a majority that the Senate shall choose him from among the two candidates with the highest electoral vote total. Senate Joint Resolution 12 provides that both Houses in joint session and voting by the head, as for President, shall elect the Vice President from among the candidates with the three highest numbers of electoral votes. This provision would also guard against the possibility of electing a President and Vice President from different parties.

So I point out that while we equalize the rights of individual citizens to vote for President, we recognize the validity that bigger States should have more authority if it comes to be decided in the House of Representatives, so that we also are fair and equitable to the big States by giving them more authority than they have now. We do not attempt to simply take power from one or the other but rather to equalize the power of both and to recognize that mere accident of geographical residence should give one American citizen more than 14 times as much significance, stature, and authority in the voting booth as another American citizen, and this is what occurs today.

We believe that the large States should have their proportionate power—no one is advocating taking away the 43 votes of New York—but we do believe that this power should be registered in the electoral college on the basis in which the people voted it. To do otherwise or, in other words, to continue the present system of general ticket voting, with its cumulative effect which produces 2d-, 3d-, and even 15th-class voting citizens, would be to give some individuals a greater voting power than they deserve.

The fact that this type of a result is clearly wrong, no matter how or where it is achieved, was pointed out by Chief Justice Warren in *Reynolds v. Sims* when he said:

"It would appear extraordinary to suggest that a State could be constitutionally permitted to enact a law providing that certain of the State's voters could vote 2, 5, or 10 times for their legislative representatives, while voters living elsewhere could vote only once. And it is inconceivable that a State law to the effect that, in counting votes for legislators, the votes of citizens in one part of the State would be multiplied by 2, 5, or 10, while the votes of persons in another area would be counted only at face value, could be constitutionally sustainable. Of course, the effect of State legislative districting schemes which give the same number of representatives to unequal numbers of constituents is identical. Overweighting and overvaluation of the votes of those living here has the certain effect of dilution and undervaluation of the votes of those living there. The resulting discrimination against those individual voters living in disfavored areas is easily demonstrable mathematically. Their right to vote is simply not the same right to vote as that of those living in a favored part of the State. Two, five, or ten of them must vote before the effect of their voting is equivalent to that of their favored neighbor. Weighting the votes of citizens differently, by any method or means, merely because of where they happen to reside, hardly seems justifiable. One must be ever aware that the Constitution forbids "sophisticated as well as simpleminded modes of discrimination."

We are all familiar with the fact that *Reynolds v. Sims* deals with legislative apportionment on the State level and was an attempt to give a more equal share of the voting strength to the urban areas but this does not detract from the basic premise that such weighting is wrong. It can be the other way around. The Chief Justice mentioned this in a footnote to his opinion when he pointed out that in the early 19th century the cities held the disproportionate repre-

sentation and in the future the situation might be reversed again. The situation is reversed now as far as presidential elections are concerned and it should be rectified. As Warren said: "To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen. The fact that an individual lives here or there is not a legitimate reason for overweighting or diluting the efficacy of his vote. The complexions of societies and civilizations change, often with amazing rapidity. A nation once primarily rural in character becomes predominantly urban. Representation schemes once fair and equitable become archaic and outdated. But the basic principle of representative government remains, and must remain, unchanged—the weight of a citizen's vote cannot be made to depend on where he lives."

Before closing I would like to mention one additional and important point. Much has been said and written about minority Presidents. The major factor in such an occurrence is undoubtedly the general ticket—unit rules system. By breaking this up we would go a long way in eliminating such a possibility. It will not eliminate it entirely because as was pointed out in the memorandum prepared by the staff of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments following the hearings in 1961 two other factors contribute to such a possibility: (1) The minimum of three electoral votes for each State, and (2), the allocation of additional electors on the basis of population.

With one exception, no plan proposed in the past would eliminate completely the possibility of a minority President. That one exception is a direct national election. I have mentioned this not because I consider this a basic flaw in any other plan including Senate Joint Resolution 12 but because I think it should be made very clear why this possibility, so small it is almost infinitesimal once the general ticket system is broken up, must continue to exist.

As long as this Nation follows the principle of equality of States—the basis of federalism—it must exist. Under this system each State is allocated two electors corresponding to its Senators and a minimum allowance of at least one more regardless of the population of the State. To quote from the memorandum "Obviously, any system which preserves the Federal principle and its three-vote minimum allows for the possibility that a majority of the electoral vote may go to a candidate who receives fewer popular votes. Indeed, this was the original purpose of the electoral vote bonus for smaller States, so that the greater populations of the larger States could not dictate the selection of the President. It was part of the compromise which made the Constitution possible."

Mr. Chairman, the emphasis here is mine—although the quote is from this subcommittee's memorandum. I have included this because, as I have said, I feel that this is important. We should attempt to reduce the possibility of a minority President by doing away with that which contributes the most to such a possibility and is neither needed nor desired to preserve our Federal system but we should not become so obsessed with the idea of elimination that we destroy the principle of statehood imbedded in our Constitution. To do so we would, as the old saying goes, throw the baby out with the bathwater.

In summary Mr. Chairman, I would say this. Our system of electing a President has, generally speaking, served us well during the 177 years since our Republic was established. It has never failed to give us a President.

Through no fault of the Founding Fathers, it has, however, become distorted through the use of the general ticket system. Most of the framers of the Constitution, it should be pointed out, went on record favoring a district system for choosing electors, as

the fairest method of expressing the popular will.

Senate Joint Resolution 12, is, in my opinion and the opinion of the many who support it, the only simple method by which each voter in every State will have the same voting weight in electing a President. It is the only one among the various electoral reform proposals which have been offered which will bring about a needed reform without a basic change in our constitutional system. It alone leaves control of the election machinery in the States, where it belongs.

It will bring about the balance so desperately needed in today's inequitable system. It was this imbalance that former President Truman addressed himself to in 1961 when he endorsed the district plan. At that time he said:

"The electoral college was first devised to protect the small States from dominance by the larger States, as for example, Delaware and Rhode Island from being dominated by Virginia and New York.

"The problem we face today is that of the emergence of the big cities into political overbalance, with the threat of imposing their choices on the rest of the country."

In the ensuing years since President Truman made that statement much has happened to increase the imbalance.

If you accept the thesis, which I do not, that two wrongs make a right, in 1961, the argument could be made that although large urban areas possessed a disproportionate influence in the selection of the President this was offset by a certain disproportionate representation in Congress on the part of rural areas. In effect then there was a counterbalance of interests. As has been previously pointed out this is no longer true. We have reformed and equalized the election process for the legislative branch. Now we must do likewise for the executive.

Simply put, in the past a wrong existed and logic demanded that it be rectified. Today that same wrong exists and both logic and justice demand that it be rectified.

WORLD PEACE

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, in our struggle in Vietnam, "more than the freedom of the South Vietnamese is involved," declares the Columbia, S.C., State. It believes that world peace may be at stake:

But the United States can afford nothing less than firm adherence to principle and the search for the best answer—

The paper said on February 15. Gen. Maxwell Taylor is quoted as saying:

I wonder if those concerned about war with China would say we should simply let the Communists take over in South Vietnam—

And it adds:

That effectively reiterates the position that the stand in Asia is, fundamentally and long range, one for the containment of communism.

The editorial gives a thoughtful summary of the issues before us and with the permission of my colleagues I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Feb. 15, 1966]

WEIGHING THE WAR

The questioning of our posture in southeast Asia boils down to the contention that

we should modify our military efforts there in the light of our global commitments. Under this theory, all risks of the enlargements of the war in Vietnam should be abandoned.

The considerations in Congress of the American position will either shape the war into this modified, or holding, form, or will produce a reaffirmation of the broader offensive action now in force.

Whatever the citizen's view of these two positions, the fact that Congress is now attempting to play a hand in the war could turn out to be historic. Congressional participation in forging the policy for the future holds the chance of error or offers the opportunity for wisdom.

In holding current procedures suspect, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, retired, and ex-diplomat George F. Kennan have come close to the charge that fighting it out militarily is nonsense. They say the conflict tends to weaken, militarily, our world position and risks war with Red China.

Another retired officer, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, supporting current policy, says: "I wonder if those concerned about war with China would say we should simply let the Communists take over in South Vietnam."

That effectively reiterates the position that the stand in Asia is, fundamentally and long range, one for the containment of communism.

The raising of the issue in Congress has momentarily exposed varying views and healthily brought the problem before the American people. The differences cannot be brushed aside and the issue must now be threshed out.

Widespread desire, in and out of the Government, to end the war is understandable. But opinions coming out of the congressional investigation which say, in effect, the whole stand we are taking is a mistake could be hazarding misleading unless judiciously examined by the people.

The criticism takes us to the brink of withdrawal or at least defensive stagnation in southeast Asia, but nevertheless contains points having the ring of what may be a seductive logic.

More than the freedom of the South Vietnamese is involved. World peace may be at stake. But the United States can afford nothing less than firm adherence to principle and the search for the best answer.

CONTINUATION OF THE PUBLIC LAW 874 AID TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS PROGRAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the 1967 fiscal year budget proposals contain a recommended cutback in the Public Law 874, aid to impacted school districts program. This cutback is calculated to save the U.S. Treasury some \$233 million.

Many of my Rhode Island constituents—parents, teachers, school superintendents—have written to me urging that this program be continued at its present level. I am certain my colleagues are also very well aware of the severe financial impact the proposed reduction of this fine program will have on the participating communities. In Rhode Island alone, the present entitlement of \$3,015,729 would be cut down to \$1,546,501.

The purpose of the impacted aid program is to provide financial support for educational services in those school districts which must accommodate the children of Federal employees who live on and work on Federal property, and children residing with a parent who is employed on Federal property.

Now it is obvious that one of two results must flow from any reduction in the Public Law 874 program—school districts which receive this support must either eliminate some of the educational services they provide our schoolchildren or the school district must find other means to raise funds to continue its educational efforts. I strongly oppose reducing education services, and believe it is wholly inconsistent with the recent efforts of Congress to expand educational opportunities. I also consider it grossly unfair to impose on local communities an increased tax burden to support needed educational efforts, which are imposed as a result of Federal requirements. We must remember, and this is my overriding consideration, that it is children who will suffer the effects of any cutback—and I do not believe this would be in our national interest.

There is little question of our continuing need to maintain our Federal bases and establishments. In Rhode Island, our U.S. naval bases are of great importance to the maintenance of our military strength. Let us not forget that with the conflict in Vietnam, this need

is even more apparent, and the number of personnel—and schoolchildren—will increase.

We cannot, Mr. President, take the short range view. The communities which must assimilate substantial numbers of Federal employees, need assistance in providing services to them. One of the most important services, is the education of their children. I see no useful purpose that is served by cutting back the aid to impacted school districts. The financial saving is more than offset by the hardships which will be carried by the local communities, and the resultant decline in the education of our youngsters.

This program must continue at its present level, and I intend to do all I possibly can to insure that it is.

I ask unanimous consent, that at this point in the RECORD, there be printed the breakdown of the impact on Rhode Island school districts should the budget proposal be accepted by the Congress.

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

Rhode Island	Congressional district	Present level	Proposed reduction
Newport school system, Newport.....	1	\$553,102	\$271,989
Town of Middletown School Committee, Newport.....	1	703,391	456,122
Town of Tiverton School Committee, Newport.....	1	42,015	24,466
Town of East Greenwich School Department, Kent.....	1	77,350	31,338
School Committee of the Town of Portsmouth, Newport.....	1	236,721	183,994
Town of Jamestown School Committee, Newport.....	1	42,661	22,631
Coventry School Department, Kent.....	1	105,869	41,635
Coventry School Department, Kent.....	1	0	0
Warwick School Committee, Kent.....	1	272,819	37,772
West Greenwich School Department, Kent.....	1	4,223	286
West Warwick School Department, Kent.....	1	71,798	28,902
Town of Smithfield Department of Public Schools, Providence.....	1	9,724	0
Bristol School Committee, Bristol.....	1	19,040	0
Foster School Department, Providence.....	1	4,065	0
Town of North Smithfield School Department, Providence.....	1	15,577	0
Foster Gloucester Regional School Department, Providence.....	1	5,038	0
Congressional district total.....		2,263,483	1,101,538
Town of East Greenwich School Department, Kent.....	2	0	0
Town of North Kingstown School Department, Washington.....	2	683,185	428,653
Coventry School Department, Kent.....	2	0	0
Warwick School Committee, Kent.....	2	0	0
Town of Westerly School Committee, Washington.....	2	18,434	0
Town of Charlestown School Committee, Washington.....	2	4,527	0
Richmond School Committee, Washington.....	2	2,717	0
Town of Narragansett School Committee, Washington.....	2	18,967	4,864
West Greenwich School Department, Kent.....	2	0	0
West Warwick School Department, Kent.....	2	0	0
Town of Smithfield Department of Public Schools, Providence.....	2	0	0
Bristol School Committee, Bristol.....	2	0	0
Exeter School Department, Washington.....	2	10,250	4,435
South Kingstown School Committee, Washington.....	2	42,877	7,011
Foster School Department, Providence.....	2	0	0
Charlho Regional High School District, Washington.....	2	7,289	0
Town of North Smithfield School Department, Providence.....	2	0	0
Foster Gloucester Regional School District, Providence.....	2	0	0
Congressional district total.....		788,246	444,963
Total, Rhode Island.....		3,051,729	1,546,501

UNDERSTANDING THE BACKGROUND OF THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a series of articles in the News-Journal papers of Wilmington, Del., has contributed a great deal to an understanding of the background of the Vietnam conflict.

They are written by William P. Frank, Delaware's best known newspaperman, and are illustrated by photographs taken by Bill Snead, a prize-winning photo-

journalist who is chief of the News-Journal photo department.

These two men spent 3 weeks in South Vietnam recently, talking to men from Delaware in particular but generally getting an overall impression of conditions in the country and the role Americans are playing.

I am impressed by the insight evident in the articles. They have added to my understanding of the situation. With the hope that they will also add to the understanding of others, I ask unanimous

consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Feb. 23, 1966]

NO BITTERNESS—A JOB TO BE DONE ACCEPTS LIFE IN VIET

(NOTE.—This is the first of a series in which William P. Frank, who returned earlier this month from Vietnam, reports his impressions of that nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

The greatest paradox in South Vietnam today is the average American fighting man who really doesn't know why he's there but who is not complaining or bitter.

In the main his aim is to do a good job as soon as possible and go home.

GI Joe knows that, wherever he is in South Vietnam—Saigon, in some hamlet, or even in the security of a large military installation—there is danger.

He truly believes the Vietcong is a cruel, ruthless enemy. His willingness to trust Vietnamese is complicated by the fact he doesn't understand the Vietnamese mind.

The American fighting man accepts long hours of work and duty without griping. He is not disturbed too much by the antics of the demonstrating "Vietniks" back home. He does worry a great deal about the safety and welfare of his family and wishes they wouldn't worry about him.

Several soldiers told of narrow escapes they had experienced or of having been shot at by Vietcong and then added, "But don't mention that in your stories. The folks back home might get worried."

In general, the American soldier is careful about his life in Vietnam.

He takes his malaria pills with strict regularity once a week. He avoids drinking water, except when he is positive it's safe.

He prefers American-type cooking to the strange dishes of the country.

While he admires and raves about the charm and beauty of the Vietnamese girls, he wouldn't want to take them home to meet mom or dad.

He has learned to bargain with street vendors and quite often beats them at their own game.

He keeps abreast of the news principally through the excellent Pacific edition of the Stars and Stripes, the Armed Forces Radio, and several American news magazines.

He has learned how to be extremely patient in air terminals when he has to spend hours waiting for a plane.

Many of the GI's have caught on to the spirit and philosophy of the civic action program of the United States and are willing to devote their off-duty hours to teaching Vietnamese children English or working in an orphanage or rescuing Vietnamese civilians in a battle zone.

But ask the average GI, "Why are you here?" and he'll say, as if he had learned it by rote: "We're fighting to stop communism."

If the soldier has had no more than a high school education, he will not elaborate on that. If he is a college man, he will discuss the possibilities of communism's spreading to other parts of the Pacific and getting closer to his native country.

He hasn't too much to say about the Vietnamese soldier, first, because the average GI can't communicate with the natives and, next, because he doesn't come in contact with too many.

The average GI knows practically nothing about the history or ancient culture of Vietnam, except that he does know the French were there until recent years.

He has little or no respect for the Vietnamese police in Saigon and he knows that these police will not interfere with him. However, the soldier has a healthy respect for the U.S. military police who are always combing the bar districts in towns.

Of the several hundred American soldiers I've talked with in bars, restaurants, military installations, on planes and in bleak air terminals, none wanted to appear as a super-patriot.

The men, drafted or volunteers, don't want to wave the American flag and make fancy speeches about making South Vietnam safe for democracy.

The morale of the fighting man seems to increase the farther he gets from Saigon, the seedy, unkempt capital of South Vietnam. In faraway Da Nang or Chu Lai, men have told me that they have no hankering to get to Saigon.

The behavior of the American soldier in Saigon is not as bad as one would expect under the circumstances. Americans fill bars to capacity and are willing to spend lots of money buying "Saigon tea" for bar girls at the rate of about \$1.25 or \$1.30 a shot. But I saw very few American soldiers drunk on the streets.

Not all of these bar girls can be called prostitutes and when the curfew hour approaches, soldiers and girls come pouring out of the bars. Many girls are either picked up by their husbands or friends; the soldiers bunch up to hire taxis or pedicabs and make off for their billets.

Of course, a lot of them go off to parties but when the curfew time arrives, the streets of Saigon become as dead as Market Street in Wilmington at 4 in the morning.

The GI's have the greatest contempt for taxi drivers and pedicabblers who bedevil any American on the streets of Saigon. The taxi drivers and the pedicabblers will always try to overcharge and if the soldier knows his way around, he will pay what he thinks a trip was worth and just walk away from the squawking cabbies.

It is true, however, that some meaningful friendships have developed between the Americans and Vietnamese girls. In the better restaurants and in the officers' open mess in Saigon, it is not unusual to see soldiers and their Vietnamese dates, who are lovely in their native dress.

Oddly enough, even though prostitution is rampant in Saigon, there are very few street-walkers. The streets are loaded with pimps approaching Americans to tell them where they can obtain "nice young girls."

When police do raid houses of prostitution, the girls are always held for court but "the foreigners" are always released. This is in keeping with the practice of the Vietnamese police to "interfere" with Americans as little as possible.

Technically, it is illegal for American soldiers to possess U.S. currency or "green" money. They get their money either in Vietnamese piasters or military currency.

Military money, which looks like the old American shinplasters, is adorned with the pictures of bobbed-haired American beauties and is used exclusively on military installations, at all post exchanges, in the USO, and officers' open messes.

The American soldiers travel around Vietnam chiefly on military planes on the basis of first come, first served at military passenger terminals.

Newsman also travel that way and their press cards are accepted as "flight orders."

In Saigon, the Army operates buses to and from important points such as the Tan Son Nhut Airbase, or the major post exchange in Cholon, the Chinese section of Saigon.

For American servicemen who do not choose to wait for these buses, there are always the taxis and the pedicabs.

Army trucks and jeeps often will pick up servicemen, if there is room.

It is a common sight in Saigon, as throughout Vietnam where American forces are stationed, to see soldiers fully armed—rifles, submachineguns, revolvers in hip holsters or arm holsters. However, when entering PX's, the USO, or air terminals, the men are required to remove the clips from their guns.

The accommodations for the American fighting men range from comfortable billets in hotels that have been taken over by the United States to pup tents out in the field.

In the large installations, such as those for the marines near Da Nang or An Khe, the accommodations will range from tents with wooden floors and wooden sides to large tents erected right over the bare ground.

There is the widest variety in how the men in the military installations will try to spruce up and make the best of their tent cities. Some units have taken to planting native trees and even cultivated American corn for decorative and nostalgic purposes.

Some have built streets out of scrap lumber and what field stone they can find. Others have taken bits of the treads used for emergency air strips and used them as bridges over deep gutters.

The marines at a place called Chu Lai, on the South China Sea, have revealed a sense of humor. The area there is nothing but dark red sand dunes and scrub pines.

But in front of the small tent air terminal at Chu Lai, the sand has been raked clean and a sign put there, "Keep off the grass."

Hundreds of GI's have learned that they can buy expensive cameras very cheaply in the PX's—cameras that would sell for \$350 back home, going for half that price.

A lot of them don't know how to use the cameras but they've got them.

At the main PX in Saigon, there's always a long waiting line of men trying to get into the camera, radio and tape recorder departments.

As souvenir buyers, no one can equal the American GI. He likes the Vietnamese doll in native attire, all kinds of luggage said to be made of elephant hides, imitation ivory chess sets, all kinds of imitation teakwood figures, lacquer boxes of many sizes and shapes. Now a few are going in for Vietnamese art, including very good oil paintings and wash drawings on silk.

The GI has learned how to evaluate anything. The best is "No. 1," the worst "No. 10."

In restaurants, he chiefly goes for Chinese food but has found the Vietnamese chop suey is nothing like it is back home. He tries to use chopsticks but gives them up when he attempts spaghetti.

In Saigon, when the GI gets tired of the exotic Far East, he finds refuge in the USO. There he gets a safe jumbo size milk shake for a quarter; a huge hamburger for 30 cents; good vegetable soup, ice cream, and free coffee—the best in Vietnam.

It also is in the USO that he can meet friends, read a variety of American newspapers, watch television, call home through a special telephone service of the USO, at the cost of \$6 for 3 minutes, look at movies, and even play bingo.

The USO is the haven for the GI when he is weary of the hustle and bustle of Saigon and when he is not loaded with piasters.

It will take years before Vietnam gets over the impact of the American GI, and a long time before the native kids forget some of the Anglo-Saxon words they've learned.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Feb. 24, 1966]

VIETNAMESE A MYSTERY TO RANK-AND-FILE GI

(NOTE.—This is the second of a series in which William P. Frank, who returned earlier

this month from Vietnam, reports his impressions of that nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

GI Joe is ready to die in Vietnam, a country he knows little about.

Joe will go to great lengths to rescue civilians from combat zones, even at the risk of his life. He will contribute to their welfare and even get the folks at home to come across with gifts.

But he knows practically nothing about the 2,000-year history of the country, its folklore, customs, music or traditions.

However, some of the carefully selected wearers of the green beret, the elite Special Forces, are fully aware of the courage of Vietnamese junglefighters.

Air Force officers, who have trained with Vietnamese pilots, are impressed by the goals and standards of the Asians.

But the rank-and-file American soldier doesn't know, for example, that when his ancestors were in caves somewhere in Europe, the forebears of present-day Vietnamese were living in a highly developed culture of literature, art and even science.

Nor is GI Joe aware that the Vietnamese have been fighting aggressors for more than 1,500 years or that the Mongolian cavalry of the great Kublai Khan, whose empire stretched from Vienna to Peiping, was defeated by Vietnamese guerrilla forces in the 13th century.

American soldiers are in Vietnam to fight the Vietcong and the Communists of North Vietnam, but the strange thing is that the average GI can't tell a friendly Vietnamese from an unfriendly one. The chances are he has never seen a living enemy up close.

A major problem between the Americans and the natives of the country is a lack of communication. The American soldier is either too busy in his camp or on a mission. When he is in town, he is more bent on pleasure than information. Also, not too many Vietnamese can speak English beyond the jargon of the marketplace or the smoke-filled bars.

If more American servicemen could speak French, there would be, perhaps, better communication since this is the second language for so many Vietnamese, including cabbies and hotel boys. This dates back to the era when Vietnam was part of the French colonial empire.

The American soldier is tremendously impressed by the immaculate dress of the Vietnamese girls in their native costumes of black or white pantaloons, tight bodices with high collars and flowing slit-sided tunics called "ai dai," pronounced "zow die." It is a mystery how these girls can look so lovely, clean, fresh, and dignified even as they emerge from the dark and filthy hovels where they live.

In Saigon, the GI usually encounters the sneaky pedicab driver or taxi driver who pesters him with suggestions of taking him to see young girls; crowds of shoeshine kids who want cigarettes or money; innumerable street vendors who start bargaining at mountain-high prices and eventually come down to a reasonable one.

Since more Americans have arrived, the Vietnamese have become adept at the free enterprise, profitmaking system—so much so that Communists in the north probably will never convince the South Vietnamese that collectivism is the best thing in life. Never has there been such prosperity in Saigon and near the large U.S. military installations—yet, abject poverty still prevails.

While the American soldier still may not have a deep admiration for the Vietnamese, he does respect the religion and religious structures of the people. It is amazing to see small Buddha shrines and burial places

undescended in the midst of huge military camps.

During the many hours of waiting in U.S. air terminals, where American and Vietnamese soldiers have been together in a small area for hours, I saw little or no fraternization between the two. Again the chief stumbling block: lack of communication.

However, the one major religious folk custom of the Vietnamese that GI Joe has learned about is Tet, the lunar new year observed late in January amid an enormous and fantastic outburst of firecrackers that gave many an American soldier battle jitters. Tet is a 3-day uncontrolled display of firecrackers in Saigon. For example, it left the pavements stewn with layers of red remnants of firecrackers, reminiscent of confetti after a big wedding.

The Vietnamese do have a long and notable history—dating back 20 centuries. The tiny nation's history is punctuated with innumerable wars for freedom and national identity against Chinese, French, and Japanese.

Despite invasions and the domination by intruders, the Vietnamese have managed to maintain their own identity. For example, they have not used Chinese writing for centuries but have adopted the Roman letter system, or "quoc ngu," given them by French and Portuguese missionaries.

The women of all classes still cling to their native dress. This ranges from the wealthy women in public life to the humblest street vendor.

The men of the upper classes, however, have adopted western dress, but peasants still wear what Westerners would call pajamas.

Vietnamese food, by and large, is traditional—plenty of fish and a wide variety of it; also chicken, duck and pork; lots of rice and in more than recent years, blanched spaghetti, which they manipulate skillfully with chopsticks. Occasionally, the diet includes dried bat, regarded as a delicacy.

Markets are filled with vegetables, including enormous cucumbers, Chinese lettuce, plenty of watercress and mounds of sugarcane. This is sold as it is, or chopped into segments or squeezed into juice.

Butcher shops are adorned with red-glazed roasted duck, beef, yellow-glazed roasted chickens and strings of strangely shaped sausage.

Tea is the chief beverage. It's a good thing they don't drink too much water, for most homes do not have safe water or, for that matter, any kind of interior plumbing system. People must obtain water at common faucets in the street.

There is little drunkenness apparent anywhere in Vietnam. Soft drinks, particularly orange soda, have become extremely popular. Because the Vietnamese are a strong family people, it is common to see entire families squatting on pavements and/or in alleys around a common table. Food is eaten from common dishes with the ubiquitous and incredibly nimble chopsticks.

Restaurants are for the wealthy or the more prosperous Vietnamese. Streets are crowded with women and youngsters who prepare and sell food in huge pots on small charcoal burners.

Many Americans believe the ordinary people of Vietnam are unclean, so it is amazing to witness the great lengths to which they will go to wash themselves. In Saigon, the levee of the murky, garbage-filled Saigon River is usually jammed morning and afternoon with workers washing themselves. Or, it is not unusual to see pedicab drivers, even beggars, crowding around street faucets splashing themselves with water.

Everywhere in Saigon, one sees mothers combing and brushing the long hair of their daughters, and pecking around searching for lice.

The Vietnamese are a small, wiry people. The average man isn't more than 5 feet, 4 inches and weighs about 105 pounds. He appears much younger than he really is.

The women also are diminutive. A 20-year-old woman looks like a girl of 15. It is rare to see a corpulent Vietnamese.

American helicopter pilots have a rule: Their aircraft will accommodate five Americans, but eight or nine Vietnamese.

Vietnam is really a variety of peoples. Those in the lowlands are commonly called Vietnamese. In the highlands are the Montagnards, an independent group, distinct in habits and customs. There are also other minorities such as the Khmers who are actually Cambodians and the smallest minority known as Chams.

Most of the Vietnamese are Buddhists. Other religions are Confucianism, Taoism, Cao daism, and Christianity.

The Christians are mostly Catholic. The Catholic faith was strengthened with the coming of French colonialism in the late 19th century. The Catholic cathedral in the heart of Saigon is interesting because its architecture is Western and its stained glass windows have Western figures, with very little evidence of Far Eastern culture.

Cao Dai is a recent religion, made up of Christianity, Buddhism, and several other faiths. Its followers have their own pope and a strange assortment of saints, including Victor Hugo. This is a militant religious group, almost approaching the status of a political party.

The extent of education among the people is not known although many youngsters in Saigon say they go to school in the morning and work in the afternoon. Many schools are operated by Catholic nuns. Wealthy Vietnamese send their children abroad for schooling.

However, even the poorest street vendor or wizened and toothless cabbie is a financial wizard when calculating and establishing a ratio of U.S. money and Vietnamese piastres.

Saigon has far more book stores than one anticipates—chiefly selling paperback books in Vietnamese, French, and English. These do not cater exclusively to visitors or servicemen, but also to the people, with the books spread out on sidewalks.

When one gets to know the Vietnamese, he learns that, in the main, they are honest. Once an agreement has been reached about the price of something, they stick to it.

In South Vietnam at least, the people usually are gentle and speak in a high-pitched tonal language, using the same words for different meanings according to the tone of the voice.

Their folk songs are as sad as most of the people are—usually songs of unrequited love and longing for peaceful days in gardens with beautiful flowers.

Their festivals are marked with striking floral displays and potted trees. In Saigon, nothing is more gorgeous, more vivid in color than the flower market, which is patronized chiefly by the people.

The people's arts and crafts are anything but primitive. Several art exhibits in Saigon revealed a wonderful sensitivity, more often in the Western style and abstractionism than oriental.

Artists are fond of brush painting on silk, using native themes of farmers and boys riding water buffaloes.

In the crafts, nothing surpasses their lacquer boxes and lacquer panels, designed with exquisite delicacy.

The people patronize movies so often that most of the theaters have a reserved-seat system for French, Chinese, and American films. In Saigon, one can also go to the traditional theater, which is reminiscent of the Chinese stage, yet slightly different.

A casual Western observer may think that the Vietnamese are lazy because of the heat, the humidity, and the long afternoon siestas. He also will see many Vietnamese taking life easy as they squat on their haunches on curbs or against building walls.

But nothing is as hectic as the heavy Saigonese traffic with thousands of taxis, pedicabs, and the millions of bicycles—so many vehicles belching forth clouds of blue exhaust fumes. A pedestrian can't help wondering whether he faces asphyxiation during an afternoon stroll.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Feb. 25, 1966]

ILLNESS KILLS MORE SOUTH VIETS THAN BATTLES

(NOTE.—This is the third of a series in which William P. Frank, who returned earlier this month from Vietnam, reports his impressions of that nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

Disease kills more people in South Vietnam than the enemy, the ruthless Vietcong.

The principal aim of the Vietcong is to destroy leaders of provinces or hamlets, schoolteachers, priests, community spokesmen—those who can influence the people against communism.

But disease in that sad country of southeast Asia is more "democratic." It lashes out at everyone.

According to the latest reliable figures, cited in a recent issue of the American Medical Association Journal, a little more than 46 percent of the deaths in South Vietnam occur among children up to 15 years of age.

In the United States, comparable statistics show the death rate for that age group is 9 percent.

The journal also reported that of all the children born in 1958—the last year of any reliable statistics—half were destined to die before their fifth birthday.

The maternal death rate in Vietnam is reported to be 25 times higher than that in the United States. Eight percent of babies born in Vietnamese hospitals never leave them alive.

According to Dr. John M. Levinson, of Wilmington, now in Vietnam for his third tour of volunteer service among the people, there's no reason to believe that the situation has improved since 1958.

"In fact," Levinson said, "the disease problem has increased. Except for what a few American doctors have been able to contribute on a volunteer basis, the medical problem has increased."

It is also reasonable to conclude that if the war is escalated, more civilians will be hurt.

American casualties are cared for in U.S. military hospitals; Vietnamese military personnel have facilities, but the hapless civilian victims—the adults and children—must depend upon meager first-aid clinics and civilian hospitals already overcrowded, understaffed, and woefully short of supplies.

American doctors, not connected with the U.S. military effort but who are volunteering their skills among the people, have repeatedly told me that American guns may win the war, but it'll be up to American medical science to win the peace.

"That may sound like a tired cliché but it's the gospel truth," said Dr. George McInnes of Augusta, Ga., who heads an American medical team in a Da Nang civilian hospital. But medical help "is what the people see and understand—American compassion and concern for them. This is what is going to give them strength and confidence in America."

In a mountain village near Dalat is a small hospital operated by Dr. James Turpin. This hospital is called Project Concern, and

is supported by contributions, many of which come from jaycee units in various parts of the United States.

Levinson has been working chiefly in a large maternity hospital in Saigon. One day recently 12 babies were delivered by midwives in one section of the hospital with a lone native doctor in attendance.

It is rare to see more than one or two Vietnamese doctors on duty in a civilian hospital. Most of them have been taken into the Vietnamese Army. It is estimated that there are not more than 200 Vietnamese civilian doctors for a nation with a population of 15 million. To make matters worse, most Vietnamese are extremely poor and they live in remote, rural areas.

At present, according to rough guesses, there are about 50 American doctors in South Vietnam. They are working in clinics and hospitals, treating every kind of imaginable case from war wounds to tuberculosis and cancer.

One of the major sources of disease in Vietnam is improper facilities for disposal and treatment of sewage and waste. Saigon, once hailed as the "Pearl of the Orient," has mounds of garbage on pavements and streets. It is uncollected for days at a time, making ideal breeding and nesting places for rats.

Supervision or control of food markets is virtually nonexistent; most restaurants are filthy. Untreated sewage is dumped into rivers; people live along these bodies of water and bathe in them.

Water is drawn from common taps in streets, and only the fact that the water is boiled for tea or soups, spares the people even greater disease.

Among the common maladies in the country are malaria, tuberculosis, various intestinal diseases, meningitis, typhoid, polio, and some leprosy.

According to one report, trachoma—a disease of the eyelids—is so common that at least four-fifths of the population has been infected with it at one time or another.

Levinson recently reported in an article in the American Medical Association Journal that it is not uncommon to see a leper sitting on the streets of Saigon begging for money or food.

Parasites of all kinds abound. According to Levinson, the peasant must face reinfection with parasitic diseases, since he must work barefooted in the flooded rice paddies where he is exposed again and again.

Residents of rural areas believe innumerable medical superstitions. These result from folklore from China. Only recently are these people beginning to accept Western medicines.

Peoples in villages that have been raked by the war, are known to carry their wounded on crude stretchers for miles to see the "bac si my," the American doctor.

Hospitals are so overcrowded, however, that it is meaningless to measure a hospital's capacity in bed space. Patients, small though the people are, live two and three in a bed. Sometimes, two cots are put together to accommodate four, maybe five patients.

Hospital attendants and hard-working nuns of nearby churches are unable to meet the demands of patients; so it is not unusual to see relatives of the sick on the wards, feeding, washing and given other attention to their ailing kin.

It is true that in many instances, American military doctors offer their services and so do other military personnel, but all of this is on a when-and-if-time-is-available basis.

The arrival of an American doctor in a civilian hospital is quite an event. Word spreads swiftly through the wards.

Levinson, for example, had no specific hour for arriving on his first day at the

large maternity hospital. When he showed up at 8, he learned a patient had been readied and Levinson was to operate. The woman had been kept under anesthesia for at least 40 minutes, waiting for the "bac si my."

The United States through what is now known as U.S. Agency for International Development does provide some facilities and equipment for civilian hospitals but it is the American doctor himself, big as life, always smiling, stumbling through basic Vietnamese with a sprinkling of French who represents to the people the heart of the Americans.

"Giving of one's self is the key to success here," a doctor in Da Nang told me.

"Assistance from the free world and from civilian volunteer agencies offers a challenge to American medicine to help defeat communism in southeast Asia," Levinson adds.

Mere equipment, stamped with the U.S. AID emblem, won't do the job alone.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Feb. 26, 1966]

OPEN POLLS HAZY IDEA TO SOUTH VIETS

(NOTE.—This is the fourth in a series in which William P. Frank, who returned earlier this month from South Vietnam, reports his impressions of the nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

Nguyen, a floor boy at the Hotel Catinat in Saigon, tried to explain his idea of freedom.

In broken English sprinkled with a few French words, it amounted to this:

"Freedom means I can work where I want to work. I can change my job to make more money. I can live in peace—no bullets—no Vietcong."

But he couldn't describe the kind of government now operating in South Vietnam, nor did he seem to have any concept of the American form of representative government.

Although he can read and write Vietnamese, the theory that Nguyen could someday elect his own representatives in the nation's government was incomprehensible. It must be equally difficult to understand for the illiterate peasants who comprise the bulk of the 15 million people in that nation today.

What will the Nguyens, the millions of peasants and others in Vietnam do or say when a new constitution is offered to them this year? What will their reactions be when popular elections are held next year? It is impossible to predict.

The U.S. Army's "Area Handbook for Vietnam," prepared 4 years ago, makes this observation:

"The vast majority of the people (of South Vietnam) have little notion and less experience of representative government and democratic processes.

"An educated, Western-influenced urban minority, intellectually familiar with constitutional concepts and influenced by democratic ideals, is eager for a larger voice in national affairs and impatient with government restrictions and controls."

This was written in the days of Ngo Dinh Diem, the first President of South Vietnam, who was assassinated during a coup staged by the military in November 1963.

A few months earlier, a 123-member National Assembly was approved in a popular election. Candidates supported by Diem got 92 percent of the vote. This would make any American arch a quizzical brow.

It is important for Americans to understand that his concept of popular democratic government is something the average Vietnamese reads about in his newspaper or hears discussed on radio, but does not grasp.

Presidents, chiefs of state or Prime Ministers in South Vietnam represent a distant authority in Saigon to the majority of the people in the villages. What the majority of

people in the country knows about government revolves around the province chiefs or hamlet leaders.

This is the way the people have been ruled for centuries—first under the mandarins of the royal government, then under French colonialism, then the Japanese, and down to the present day.

As recently as January 6, the Mansfield committee of the U.S. Senate—which included U.S. Senator J. CALLEN BOGGS, Republican, of Delaware—on its return from Vietnam wrote:

"The new leadership in (Vietnamese) Government which is drawn largely from military circles, is young and hopeful but with little knowledge of politics."

The United States has been in and around the South Vietnamese Government, officially and unofficially, since 1945. Sometimes Americans openly took part in promoting certain men for top office in Vietnam, notably in the case of Diem, who turned out as a failure. Lyndon B. Johnson, when he was Vice President, had acclaimed him as the "Winston Churchill of Vietnam."

American advisers are still active in many segments of the Vietnamese Government. For example, a former prison official of Montana has been chief adviser for the National Police of Vietnam for several years.

A number of high-ranking U.S. Army officers have been assigned for years to Vietnam to help train its army, including Gen. John (Iron Mike) O'Daniel, formerly of Newark, Del., now a resident of San Diego, Calif.

However, American advisers generally insist that they are just that, advisers, and try to keep out of the internal affairs.

Col. Edward G. Lansdale, an expert in Philippine affairs, was, however, prominently involved in the administration of Diem.

The great problem in Vietnamese Government today is conceded to be the outlook of the villagers—whether they feel the South Vietnamese Government and the American forces are strong enough to protect them from the terrorism of the Vietcong.

The Mansfield report stated that some observers believe that no more than 25 percent of the country's villages under South Vietnam control will be free enough from Communist intimidation to take part openly in the election this year.

The Army's handbook on Vietnam also pointed out:

"It seems clear that the villager wants peace and security above all else. Confronted with the competing armed authority of the Government and of the Vietcong, he will accept what he must and respond slowly and cautiously to efforts to win his loyalty."

In effect, South Vietnam now has a military government called the Congress of Armed Forces.

But the country actually is run by what is known as the National Leadership Council, composed of top-ranking officers Maj. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu has the title of Chief of State. Vice Air Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky is Prime Minister, and there are seven other generals on the council.

Sometimes Thieu speaks for the Government; sometimes Ky.

Several months ago, a copy of what passes for the present constitution of the nation was posted on the bulletin board of the press lounge in the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office. It was one of the most-ignored items there.

The document has many fine-sounding phrases, such as this: "The rear (home-front) must be stable so that a solid foundation could be progressively laid and a tradition of liberty and democracy could be developed in an atmosphere of struggle and revolution."

On January 14, Ky addressed the Armed Forces Congress and admitted shortcomings since he became Prime Minister last June.

Indicating that some of the provisions of the "constitution" that had not yet been implemented, Ky said:

"We must also recognize that due to present circumstances, the Government still is unable to create a favorable political climate."

He then proceeded to talk about democracy suited for Vietnam and not for any other country.

He proposed seminars among the people in which they will be able to discuss the kind of government they want. He promised that a constitution will be proposed next October, a referendum held and the document promulgated in November.

He also promised that a civil government will replace the military government next year.

There is still no indication of what political parties will emerge or how much freedom they will have.

Much will depend on whether the religious factions will hold their temper, on whether the independent-thinking minority groups, such as the strange Montagnards of the highlands, will agree to come into the new Vietnam great society and, of course, on the progress of the war.

To date, there is no evidence of any strong opposition party in Vietnam except, of course, the National Liberation Front—the Communists. Even in the provinces, the terms of chiefs don't last long; they are either captured or killed by the Vietcong or are deposed by the Saigon government.

There are always subrosa stories of province chiefs with sticky fingers.

Only recently, 110 television sets were distributed by the United States, in one province, earmarked for the people.

The idea was that the people would be able to learn more about the outside world and get the democratic message via television, beamed from airplanes.

Just before the television programs began, an American official decided to check to see what happened to the sets.

He discovered that of 110, about 60 were in the homes of province officials or in police stations. Obviously, that's not the use for which the television had been intended.

It is presumed they are now in public areas where the peasants can see television.

What is the future of Ky?

At present, the Ky government is trying to win the loyalty of the people by sending out teams into the villages to teach the people about democracy but the teams are still encountering the entrenched interests of the village chiefs.

The other day, in announcing reshuffling of cabinet officials, Ky said in effect, "I do not choose to run for public office."

But then other public figures have said the same thing and ended up in the saddle.

Historians and political scientists knowledgeable in Asian affairs are now advising caution in evaluating the political situation in South Vietnam. In the past two and a quarter years, there have been three coups, four attempted coups and at least 20 reshuffles in the government.

FURTHER TRIBUTE TO ALBERT THOMAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as a continuation of the tribute to the late Congressman Albert Thomas which I made on the floor of the Senate Friday, February 25, 1966, I would like to insert several matters pertaining to the final rites of this great Texan, which have

been received by me subsequent to last Friday.

Although the tributes and descriptions of Albert Thomas will continue to call our attention to the outstanding nature of this remarkable individual for a long time, I think an account of the final rites should be printed for history in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Houston Post of Friday, February 18, 1966, entitled "Albert Thomas Laid To Rest With Military Ceremonies," the article from the Houston Chronicle of Saturday, February 19, 1966, entitled "The Saddest Bugle Call, Day Is Done for Thomas," the articles from the Houston Post of Saturday, February 19, 1966, entitled "Thomas Bade Farewell" and "High Officials Attend Rites," and the tribute which appeared in Maurine Parkhurst's column in the Thursday, February 24, 1966, Houston Chronicle be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 18, 1966]

ALBERT THOMAS LAID TO REST WITH MILITARY CEREMONIES

U.S. Representative Albert Thomas, 67, was buried today in a military cemetery in Houston's North Side.

An eight-gun salute was fired. A bugler blew taps as the coffin was lowered into the grave.

A score or more of his colleagues from the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C., attended the military service.

ALLEN GIVES EULOGY

Earlier this afternoon, Dr. Charles L. Allen eulogized Thomas at a service in First Methodist Church.

Dr. Allen quoted President Johnson:

"Of the qualities that made Albert Thomas a remarkable man, devotion to the people he served and loyalty to his friends stand higher than all."

The church was filled with financiers, labor leaders, millionaires, and other friends.

"COURTEOUS, COURTLY"

And many followed the hearse to the Veterans' Administration cemetery on Airline-Steubner Road.

Albert Thomas has represented Houston in Congress for 30 years.

Dr. Allen summed up Thomas as "courteous, courtly, polite—he never forgot to be a gentleman."

Thomas died Tuesday of cancer in his Washington, D.C., home. His body was flown here in a Presidential fleet plane Wednesday night.

A steady flow of mourners came to the Settegast-Kopf Funeral Home chapel, 3300 Kirby, where the body of Thomas lay in state until the funeral.

The chapel's Colonial Room was filled with wreaths from many individuals and organizations. Thomas, known as a titan of Washington, was also known down to the lowest in the ranks of labor from whence he drew much of his Democratic strength.

His familiar greeting of "podnah" for all set him apart from most political leaders. His office door was always open to his constituents.

There was nothing of snobbery about him. He was shrewd, gregarious and yet quiet.

Thomas came to Houston in 1930 from Nacogdoches, one of the first Anglo-Saxon settlements in Texas. He had been county attorney there after graduating from Rice

University and the University of Texas Law School, and attending Harvard Law School.

He became an assistant U.S. attorney in Houston and traveled the southern district of the Federal court for 6 years before running for Congress and winning in 1936. He took his seat in January 1937, in the 75th Congress. He had filed for a seat in the next Congress when he died.

Gov. John Connally, Attorney General Wagoner Carr, Secretary of State Crawford Martin, and U.S. Judge Homer Thornberry were flown here for the funeral.

They were joined at the South Main Church by a large congressional delegation, led by Texas two Senators, RALPH YARBOROUGH and JOHN TOWER, and U.S. Representative GEORGE MAHON of Lubbock, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, of which Thomas was the second ranking member.

Texas Members of the House who announced they would be in the funeral delegation include:

Representatives BOB POAGE, of Waco, O. C. FISHER, of San Angelo, CLARK THOMPSON, of Galveston, WALTER ROGERS of Pampa, JOHN DOWDY of Athens, JACK BROOKS of Beaumont, JIM WRIGHT of Fort Worth, JOHN YOUNG of Corpus Christi, BOB CASEY of Houston, HENRY GONZALEZ of San Antonio, GRAHAM PURCELL of Wichita Falls, RAY ROBERTS of McKinney, JAKE PICKLE of Austin, EARLE CABELL of Dallas, ELIGIO DE LA GARZA of Mission, and RICHARD C. WHITE of El Paso, all Democrats.

Also, the following members of the House Appropriations Committee: Representatives MIKE KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, JAMIE WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, JOHN FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, JOE EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, FRANK BOW, Republican, of Ohio, EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, of Indiana, WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Republican, of Ohio, ROBERT N. GAIMO, Democrat, of Connecticut, THOMAS G. MORRIS, Democrat, of New Mexico, and GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, Democrat, of Illinois.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of which Thomas also was a member, will be represented by its chairman, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, and Representative MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois.

At death, Thomas ranked 11th in House seniority and No. 2 on the powerful House Appropriations Committee.

He had led major subcommittees since 1949. He steered much to Houston, particularly to the ship channel and finally the Manned Spacecraft Center on Clear Lake, which will be his greatest monument.

THOMAS' last resting place is the Veterans' Administration Cemetery on Steubner-Airline Road, deep in his congressional district and which he helped to create.

He chose that over Arlington National Cemetery as a place of burial. He was a World War I veteran, being discharged as a lieutenant.

Six soldiers from Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio acted as pallbearers.

Veterans held services at the cemetery.

His survivors include his wife, Mrs. Lera Thomas, and his daughters, Mrs. Anne Lasater of Houston and Brazil and Miss Lera Thomas of Houston.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 19, 1966]
THE SADDEST BUGLE CALL, DAY IS DONE FOR THOMAS

(By Zarko Franks)

He lies buried today in a cemetery carved from a prairie of scrub pine, yupon, and weeds.

The eulogies had been delivered, a bugler sounded taps, a 24-shot rifle salute fired.

Two U.S. Senators, about 30 U.S. Congressmen, the affluent, the wealthy, the humble, and the unknown were there at the Veterans' Administration Cemetery on Airline-Steubner Road in the deep north side.

The widow had so willed it and Albert Thomas was buried there on the lonely prairie.

His body, as the preacher said, was "tenderly committed" to the earth.

Eight soldiers from Fort Sam Houston fired their rifles. Each fired a volley of three rounds.

From heaven's blue dome came a golden sun.

As the bronze coffin in a lead vault was lowered into the ground, a soldier blew taps, the saddest of all bugle calls.

FOR 30 YEARS

For Albert Thomas, 67, a cancer victim, day was done. For 30 years he had served this community in the halls of Congress.

Bureaucrats feared him, colleagues admired him, his constituents swore by him.

Albert Thomas was the north side. Oilmen gave him testimonial dinners. They courted him at the Houston Club.

SECRET FOR SUCCESS

He placated them, yes, and worked for them. But Albert Thomas knew where his voting strength rested. In the union halls among plumbers, longshoremen and pipefitters.

He once confided to a friend his secret for success in politics.

"There are more votes among the working class than in River Oaks."

This he believed and worked at. But the wonder of his political magic lies in the fact that he worked equally hard for big business and the oil industry in Texas.

The Cadillacs, as they must, led the funeral parade from First Methodist Church, Main and Clay.

FORDS AND CHEVVIES

But there were more Fords and Chevies in the motorcade.

A Negro union laborer remarked: "That's just the way Mr. Albert would have wanted it."

The congressional delegation, including U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat of Texas, and U. S. Senator JOHN TOWER, Republican of Texas, was near the undertaker's tent.

In the delegation were about 30 Congressmen including BOB CASEY, Houston; HENRY GONZALEZ, San Antonio; JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, and CLARK THOMPSON, Galveston.

Also at the graveside military funeral were oilman-publisher John Mecom and his wife, Chronicle editor Everett Collier and his wife; John T. Jones, Jr., radio and television stations owner; Mayor Louie Welch and Mrs. Welch; Brown & Root's George Brown, and other big names in this community.

After taps was sounded, the six soldiers from Fort Sam Houston, moved clockwise to fold the U.S. flag before the coffin was lowered.

The flag was folded in triangular sections, then presented to the widow, Mrs. Lera Thomas.

Earlier, at the church service, Dr. Charles Allen, pastor of the First Methodist Church, had delivered the eulogy.

The crowd, not capacity, was estimated at about 2,000. However, about 400 people lined Clay Street outside the church.

Dr. Allen quoted President Lyndon Johnson's words:

"Of the qualities that made Albert Thomas a remarkable man, devotion to the people he served and loyalty to his friends stand higher than all."

The church was filled with financiers, politicians, labor leaders, and congressional representatives.

Texas Gov. John Connally was among those who had come to pay their respects.

In his eulogy Dr. Allen also quoted the late John F. Kennedy, who described Thomas as the kind of man "old enough to dream dreams and young enough to see visions."

Dr. Allen summed up Thomas as "courteous, courtly, polite—he never forgot to be a gentleman."

Perhaps the finest tribute to Thomas was paid by a mourner on Clay Street. He was a Latin-American, probably first generation American. He said:

"I'm happy they're burying him in the North Side. That's where he belongs, near his people."

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 19, 1966]

THOMAS BADE FAREWELL

(By Harold Scarlett)

The meek and the mighty joined Friday in a last reverent farewell to Representative Albert Thomas.

His beloved "home folks" and famous figures from Washington and Austin—more than 2,000 in all—came to the funeral in the downtown First Methodist Church.

They heard Dr. Charles L. Allen, the dead Congressman's minister, intone:

"His name is permanently inscribed on the pages of time. Truly Albert Thomas walked through life with purpose and without fear."

Then, to the keening wail of taps and the crash of musketry, the mourners saw the body of Thomas—a country boy who became a congressional giant—committed back to the Texas earth he always loved.

THOMAS, fittingly, was buried in the new Veterans' Administration Cemetery at 10410 Steubner-Airline Road.

The cemetery in northeast Harris County was one of the last of many Federal emoluments which Thomas secured for the "home folks" during almost 30 years as Houston's congressional "water boy."

His wife Lera requested his burial there. She knew the cemetery was close to his heart.

To fulfill her request, the VA waived a rule which restricts the cemetery to veterans who have died in VA hospitals.

Thomas, a lieutenant in World War I, died in his Washington home Tuesday morning. He had suffered from cancer for several years.

Old friends began assembling in the horseshoe-shaped auditorium of the First Methodist Church 2 hours before the funeral began at 2 p.m.

Many filed by the opened bronze casket in a final farewell. One was a postman in uniform. Hundreds of others had viewed the body as it lay in state at the Settegast-Kopf Funeral Home.

The body was flown to Houston on Wednesday night and remained at the funeral home until 2 hours before the service.

At the foot of the coffin, there was a spray of white chrysanthemums and red anthuriums from President Johnson and his family.

While the President was unable to attend the service, 33 Congressmen and the two Texas Senators—JOHN TOWER and RALPH YARBOROUGH—filled six front pews of the church.

Most of them flew from Washington to Houston by Air Force plane, then returned to the Capital after the funeral.

Gov. John Connally led a delegation of State leaders from Austin to the funeral. City and county officials were in the audience.

Thomas' wife and his two daughters, Mrs. Anne Lasater and Mrs. Lera Thomas, sat in the front row a few feet from the casket.

The 2,500-seat church still had some empty seats when the service began. Outside several hundred persons, apparently unaware that seats were still available, listened to the services over loudspeakers.

Behind the pulpit, a cascade of flowers covered most of the choir loft. The centerpiece was a spray of red, white, and blue blossoms in the shape of a shield, bearing the single word "Albert."

The hymn "O God, Our Help in Ages Past" opened the simple 25-minute service in the big brown-paneled auditorium where Thomas had worshiped whenever he was in Houston.

The Thomases had joined the church shortly after they moved to Houston in 1930.

An associate minister, the Reverend Frederick Marsh, read the scriptures. A second associate, the Reverend Robert Kristensen, led the opening prayer.

Reverend Kristensen in his prayer noted that Thomas, the son of a country storekeeper in Nacogdoches, had roots deep in Texas' past.

"But," he added, "the past was never a leash to hold him back, but a ladder on which to climb."

"He transformed the concept of the word 'politician' and made it never vain, haughty, or corruptive. He showed us a patriotism which enveloped not any single group, but all people."

Dr. Allen in his eulogy recalled that the late Bishop A. Frank Smith used to say that a man should always walk as if he is going somewhere.

"Albert Thomas walked through life with the walk of a man who has somewhere to go," Dr. Allen said.

He cataloged Thomas' traits—a courtly politeness; faithful work; modest self-effacement; dedication, and love of his fellow men.

"Study his voting record," the minister said, "and you see he was always for the things he thought would help people."

"He is an inspiration that will live down through the years."

With the words of homage finished, six soldiers from Sam Houston in San Antonio bore the casket to a hearse for the 14-mile journey to the cemetery.

Thomas was the 60th veteran to be buried in the VA cemetery, which held its first service last November 9.

His grave is near the end of the long entry mall, in front of the white stone hemicycle. The hemicycle is a circular, columned pavilion with a bell tower whose carillon has not yet been installed.

At the cemetery, more flowers were banked around a roped-off square surrounding the grave. Bees flitted among the wreaths.

The Washington legislators, arriving in a cortege of limousines, stood in a body at the foot of the grave. From the hearse, the soldier pallbearers moved the casket to the grave between a double rank of Houston firemen.

Underfoot, the rain-logged earth yielded to their tread.

The mall of the new cemetery, only recently sprigged with grass, is still mostly raw earth. A big square around the grave was covered with plywood squares and tarpaulins to support the mourners.

Dr. Allen recited the final words: "We therefore tenderly commit his body to the ground."

An Army bugler blew "Taps."

Across the roadway beneath the hemicycle, seven soldiers fired three rounds into the serene blue sky. A veteran had come home.

There is no monument yet. But on the wall of the hemicycle there is a bronze plaque, set in place when the memorial was built, which could be an epitaph. It reads:

"Albert Thomas, soldier—humanitarian—statesman"

"Whose concern for America's veterans has made possible the placement of this cemetery here on the hallowed soil where honored dead sleep in Texas soil."

"Whose steadfast and uncommon public service has given the finest gift a man can give his age and time:

"The gift of a constructive and creative life."

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 19, 1966]

HIGH OFFICIALS ATTEND RITES

(By Felton West)

Congressman Albert Thomas' funeral cortege was filled Friday with high officials from every area of government, from city hall to the Halls of Congress and the Federal executive branch in Washington.

A Presidential jet airplane load of Congressmen, Senators and other Washington officials flew into the Houston International Airport at 1:20 p.m. from Washington, about an hour late because of 120-mile-an-hour headwinds and mechanical difficulties with the airplane that delayed the departure from the Capital about 10 minutes.

Being so late, the congressional party had to abandon its plan to visit Mrs. Lera Thomas, the Congressman's wife, at her home at 2184 Troon, to pay their respects. Instead, the lawmakers were driven directly to the First Methodist Church, in 14 police-escorted limousines, to attend the funeral service.

There the lawmakers sat together near the front of the church during the service. Afterward they rode in the procession to the Veterans' Administration Cemetery, saw their deceased comrade laid to rest in the earth, and gave Mrs. Thomas their condolences.

Gov. John B. Connally, Texas Secretary of State Crawford Martin, and Federal Circuit Court Judge Homer Thornberry, a former congressional colleague of Thomas, flew into International Airport in the Governor's official Lodestar airplane about 11:50 a.m.

Met there by Attorney General Waggoner Carr, who had flown into town a little earlier from Dallas, the Governor and his party, which included Houston Attorney John L. Hill, went to the Thomas home on Troon to pay their respects. They later attended the First Methodist Church service, then left for Laredo to attend the annual George Washington birthday celebration there.

A Federal Aviation Agency Jetstar airplane arrived shortly after noon bringing Gen. William F. McKee, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and James Ramey, a Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission, to the funeral. They returned to Washington after the burial service.

Webb was accompanied to the funeral by Dr. Robert Gilruth, Director of the Manned Spacecraft Center.

At least one former Governor of Texas, Price Daniel, was in the crowd at the church.

The representative of city hall was Mayor Louie Welch, and County Judge Bill Elliott and County Commissioner E. A. (Squatty) Lyons were spotted in the crowd.

Several State legislators were in the crowd, including State Senator Criss Cole of Harris County. There was State Representative Bob Eckhardt, who was an announced candidate for Thomas' congressional seat before the Congressman's death last Tuesday but had said he admired Thomas so much he would withdraw if the cancer-ridden incumbent was able to continue his lawmaking service.

In the crowd were Thomas' faithful office and appropriations committee staffs. His committee aids, Homer Skarin and Keith Mainland, had been here for several days as representatives of the House of Representatives helping with the funeral arrangements. They flew back to Washington aboard the presidential fleet jet after the burial.

Mrs. Rose Zamaria, Thomas' administrative assistant, had been in town for several days helping with the funeral arrangements. And

she will probably be here a few more days with Mrs. Thomas, along with Mrs. Mari Ball, a former assistant and longtime friend of the Congressman's.

They were joined at the funeral by the rest of Thomas' office staff, who were flown here Friday morning from Washington in a NASA Gulfstream airplane. These were Mrs. Mary Louise Schwarzman, Al Martinez, Miss Theresa Napoli and Miss Geraldine Rothwell.

Accompanying them were Willard Deason of Austin, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission; H. H. Morris, the House of Representatives Postmaster, and Herbert Botts, manager of the House gymnasium, which is named for Thomas.

The congressional party, accompanied by House Sergeant at Arms Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., included Senators RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, and Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Republican, of Texas, and these Representatives from Texas (all Democrats):

GEORGE MAHON of Lubbock, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, on which Thomas was the ranking Democrat; W. R. POAGE of Waco; O. C. FISHER of San Angelo; CLARK W. THOMPSON of Galveston; WALTER ROGERS of Pampa; JOHN DOWDY of Athens; JACK BROOKS of Beaumont; JIM WRIGHT of Fort Worth; JOHN YOUNG of Corpus Christi; BOB CASEY of Houston; HENRY B. GONZALEZ of San Antonio; GRAHAM PURCELL of Wichita Falls; RAY ROBERTS of McKinney; J. J. PICKLE of Austin; EARLE CABELL of Dallas; ELIGIO DE LA GARZA of Mission and RICHARD WHITE of El Paso.

Others in the party were Representatives MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio; JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi; JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island; JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee; TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma; FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, of Massachusetts; CHARLES R. JONAS, Republican, of North Carolina; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, of Indiana; WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Republican, of Ohio; ROBERT N. GAIAMO, Democrat, of Connecticut; THOMAS G. MORRIS, Democrat, of New Mexico; and GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, Democrat, of Illinois—all colleagues of Thomas' on the House Appropriations Committee.

The party also included Representatives CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California and MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois, two of Thomas' colleagues on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Others who came to the funeral aboard the Presidential fleet airplane were E. G. Riaden, manager of the House of Representatives bank; Navy Capt. William Fraser of the Bethesda Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., who was Congressman Thomas' doctor at the Medical Center and was with Thomas when he died; Maj. Gen. D. L. Crow, Air Force Comptroller; Maj. Gen. R. Moore, Deputy Comptroller in the Office of the Secretary of Defense; Brig. Gen. C. E. Beck, Army Comptroller, and two military liaison colonels.

Lt. Gen. William R. Calhoun of the Eighth Army Corps, Austin, attended as a representative of Lt. Gen. Thomas Dunn, commanding general of the Fourth Army.

The list of Government officials spotted in the crowd at the church and the cemetery could be almost endless.

Almost all had come in contact officially—and many, many of them on a personal friendship basis—with Thomas in his more than 29 years' service as Houston's Congressman.

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 19, 1966]
HE NEVER LOST TOUCH WITH THE WORKING PEOPLE—THEY LINED STREET TO HONOR ALBERT THOMAS

(By Bob Johnson)

The 350 to 400 people who lined Clay Street outside the First Methodist Church had no

way of knowing there were plenty of seats inside.

They probably wouldn't have gone in anyway.

Few of them really knew Congressman Albert Thomas, and one man's guess is as good as the next as to what brought most of them to his funeral.

Perhaps it was the gleaming array of limousines—23 long, black Cadillacs. Or, maybe it was the persistent rumor that President Johnson would make a last-minute appearance like he did at Billy Graham's revival in the Dome Stadium last November.

The crowd outside began to form at noon. Three Negro women—one middle aged, and two elderly—were among the early arrivals.

"I'll bet there'll be plenty of folks from Nacogdoches here today. My family traded with Mr. Thomas' daddy at his store there. Both our families were well-known there," the youngest said.

"Do you think Mrs. Thomas will come in this way?" the oldest lady asked. "I sure hope to get to see her. She's such a fine lady.

"I just came to pay my respects," she concluded.

Small squads of policemen worked in the streets surrounding the big church, briskly directing traffic and people. Occasionally one of them would stamp the pavement to ease the ache in his feet.

The crowd outside continued to grow.

Four teenage girls dressed in drill team uniforms went in the church, and that caused a small stir. Four nuns were right behind them.

Then, the first of the limousines arrived. Two police officers rushed over to the car to help the lady out.

"Who's that?" one of the outsiders asked.

"I don't know, but she has got to be somebody. Did you see the way those cops jumped when she drove up?"

Shortly, the word came back. The lady was Mrs. W. W. Fondren, whose husband was one of the founders of the Humble Oil & Refining Co.

Presently, Mrs. Thomas and members of the Thomas family arrived in two limousines. Somehow, everyone seemed to know who they were, and the chatter outside quickly subsided to a more respectful murmur.

"I thought she was going to cry," a woman said, after Mrs. Thomas went inside.

"Not on your life," her husband answered softly. "She wouldn't let that happen."

Now, the big cars began to arrive in a quick, sleek stream. The riders were Congressmen, Senators, military men, and other officials from Washington, D.C.

They arrived so quickly, the spectators on Clay Street were unable to recognize many faces. Hardly anyone saw Gov. John Connally go in, but the onlookers didn't miss Senators RALPH YARBOROUGH and JOHN TOWER riding together.

"How about that," an old man in a cowboy hat loudly exclaimed. "Never thought I'd see those two being so friendly."

No one replied to him, but some disapproving looks told him he was off base.

Finally, the word spread that the funeral service was underway, but the crowd outside stayed on. The sidewalk on Clay between Main and Travis was packed solid.

There was a lot of talk about Congressman Thomas, about how powerful he was in Washington, about how his office door was always open and about how he never failed to reply quickly to any man's letter.

One man told how Congressman Thomas always came to the Houston Post Office employees' annual picnics.

"And it didn't make any difference if he was running for office," he added. "He was always our friend. He never got so big he

didn't want to rub elbows with working people."

Then, just before the service ended, and the long drive to the cemetery began, a bum—or maybe just a poor man—hobbled up on a crutch, surveyed the crowd and lines of limousines.

He let out a low, amazed whistle. "Criminy, would you look at those cars. What's going on here, anyway?"

"Sshh," a lady in a red suit said, "You can see it's a funeral."

"Who died?" he asked, whispering quietly this time.

"Didn't you know? It's the Congressman—Albert Thomas."

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 19, 1966]

MRS. THOMAS URGED TO SEEK HUSBAND'S SEAT

A move is afoot to get Mrs. Albert Thomas to fill her husband's seat in Congress.

John McClelland, candidate for State representative, position 4 in the 22d legislative district, is a leader of the effort to petition Mrs. Thomas to run for the interim congressional term of her husband.

Thomas died Tuesday and was buried Friday.

"We hope to encourage and get Mrs. Thomas to run and get elected for the interim term ending January 1, 1967," McClelland said.

He said it was possible that Thomas' name on the May 7 Democratic primary ballot for a new term would receive a majority of the votes.

This would then make it possible for the county Democratic executive committee to select Mrs. Thomas as the Democratic nominee in the November general election, McClelland said.

Baytown chemist E. A. (Woody) Rose is the only person to file for the Republican nomination.

State Representative Bob Eckhardt and Larry McKaskle, a former aid to Mayor Louie Welch, filed for the Democratic nomination in the May Democratic primary along with Thomas.

Despite his death Thomas' name will be on the primary ballot since he had paid the full \$3,000 filing fee.

Mrs. Thomas has made no comment concerning the move to get her to fill the vacancy caused by her husband's death.

McClelland said that "because of her 30 years in Washington with her husband she could pick up much more easily than anyone else the programs he initiated and was working on at the time of his death."

"This committee intends to not only work actively, along with other volunteers, in getting petitions signed, but also to campaign on Mrs. Thomas' behalf to get her elected if she heeds the desire of those who want her to run," McClelland said.

Governor Connally left for Laredo Friday with no indication he would call the special election to fill Thomas' unexpired 2-year term over the weekend.

Eckhardt and McKaskle have indicated they would be candidates in the special election. Others may also pay the \$500 filing fee.

However, it was reported that McKaskle might change his mind and support Mrs. Thomas.

Asked about the report, McKaskle said, "I have no comment to make until I first talk with her."

"Mr. Thomas was a very good friend of mine. So is Mrs. Thomas."

Eckhardt declined comment on the possible candidacy of Mrs. Thomas and his own political plans in connection with the congressional vacancy.

There have been reports that one Texas Congressman has tried to get Eckhardt to pull out in favor of Mrs. Thomas.

"I have taken the position there ought to be at least a short political moratorium until after the (Thomas) funeral, and I don't think it appropriate to discuss the situation at this time," Eckhardt said.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 24, 1966]

A TRIBUTE

(By Maurine Parkhurst)

There have been so many splendid tributes to our late and beloved Congressman Albert Thomas, and our typewriter feels inadequate to compete with these, but our sincere affection and admiration has to thump itself into print, too.

"He was a friend of many"—this has been repeated over and over but he brought to each a deep personal feeling and sincerity. He was always kind because it was his nature, just as he was a gentleman because he could not have been otherwise.

We were respectful of his abilities and titles but these never got into the way of our warm affectionate relationship with him.

He and Lera were a magnificent team, with her dedication and service just as untiring and sincere. Her decision to further offer her services is the only light to come of this saddened dark. She has our wishes and affection—but then she has always known that.

HARRIS POLL SHOWS AMERICAN PEOPLE SUPPORT DOMESTIC PROGRAMS AND DO NOT THINK A WAR IN VIETNAM JUSTIFIED REDUCTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been much talk among many people that the American economy cannot continue to support our domestic programs in the face of our Vietnam expenditures and that there would have to be drastic cuts.

In his state of the Union message, President Lyndon B. Johnson stated:

I believe we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam.

When I returned to Congress this session I pledged to the people of Texas that I would support legislation that would insure that the great programs passed during the first session of the 89th Congress would be run effectively. I also expressed my faith in America's greatness that these programs could be implemented without having to cut them back.

To illustrate the opinion of the American people that the domestic programs should be continued, I ask unanimous consent that the Harris poll in the Washington Post of Monday, February 7, 1966, indicating that 72 percent of the public are convinced that the domestic program should not be reduced, and that education programs be supported first of all, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE HARRIS SURVEY—PUBLIC GENERALLY SEES NO REASON YET TO CHOOSE BETWEEN GUNS AND BUTTER

(By Louis Harris)

Although the American people tend to think Congress should slow down from its 1965 pace, 72 percent of the public is equally convinced that President Johnson's domestic program should not be reduced in the face of mounting commitments in Vietnam. The popular conviction seems to be that a Na-

tion so rich and prosperous need not yet choose between guns and butter.

Conservatives who backed Barry Goldwater in 1964, southerners who have consistently resented Federal incursions into their way of life, even high-income groups who suspect recent tax cuts may be short lived are included among the solid majority opposed to reducing expenditures for key programs of the Great Society.

When pressed to name those Government programs which in case of necessity ought to be cut first, two prime candidates emerged; the space program and aid to cities. The untouchables, in the judgment of most, would be aid to college education and health assistance.

A cross section of the public was asked: "In general, because of Vietnam, do you think President Johnson should reduce the size of his programs at home, such as education, poverty, and health, or do you feel these programs should not be reduced?"

[In percent]

	Reduce	Don't reduce	Not sure
Nationwide	22	72	6
By politics:			
Voted Goldwater in 1964	41	50	9
Voted Johnson in 1964	12	84	4
By region:			
East	16	81	3
Midwest	24	69	7
South	28	64	8
West	24	69	7
By income:			
Under \$5,000	18	75	7
\$5,000 to \$9,999	21	74	5
\$10,000 and over	21	65	5

Time and again, people come back to their central view that domestic programs are important and essential and are high on the list of what our young men are fighting for. But if reductions are to be made, further questioning made clear, people are prepared to draw up their own list of priorities—both for cutting and for keeping.

The cross-section was asked: "Which one of the following programs would you cut first, if one Government program had to be reduced?" and "Which one of the following programs would you cut last, if one of the Government's programs had to be reduced?"

[In percent]

	1st cut	Last cut
Space program	28	15
Aid to cities	24	6
Poverty program	20	21
Aid to farmers	11	7
Aid to college education	6	33
Aid to health care	5	15
Not sure	6	3

It is possible, of course, that Mr. Johnson's already expressed aim of providing both guns and butter will be realized in 1966. This is the clear hope of a large majority. But if reductions do become necessary, the President's treasured consensus may prove to be more difficult to achieve.

AWARD TO SENATOR ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA, OF THE GOOD CITIZENSHIP MEDAL OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a few days ago our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia, was given an award he richly deserves.

Senator ROBERTSON was presented with the Good Citizenship Medal of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, which is its highest award. The presentation was made through the Virginia branch, of which the Senator is a member.

The certificate accompanying the gold medal points out:

The society is dedicated to the patriotic purpose of perpetuating and inspiring the active practice and demonstration of those high ideals and principles which influenced and strengthened the founders of this Republic and upon which the future of our Nation depends.

Mr. President, the great Woodrow Wilson, proud of the fact that he was born in Virginia, once said:

A man's rootage is more important than his fruitage.

The rootage of Senator ROBERTSON goes back to the first permanent settlement of Jamestown, and Dr. John Woodson, who came to Jamestown with Governor Yardley in 1619. Senator ROBERTSON is a member of the Jamestown Society, made up of those whose ancestors lived in the Jamestown area prior to 1700. He belongs to the Virginia chapter of the Society of the Cincinnati, limited to those who had an ancestor serving for 3 years in the Revolutionary War. He holds membership in the Sons of the American Revolution, which is a much larger organization of descendants of Revolutionary ancestors, and of the Sons of the Confederacy, being a grandson of a Confederate officer who was killed in the Civil War.

In fact, Senator ROBERTSON's ancestors were in every war this country ever fought, and he served in the Army in World War I.

With this "rootage" it is not surprising that he has been a champion of patriotic citizenship, and student and defender of the ideals and principles upon which our Republic was founded. He is indeed worthy of the tremendous heritage which is his as Senator from the State which has given to our country, Washington, Jefferson, George Mason, Patrick Henry, James Madison, James Monroe, and so many of her greatest and noblest sons.

Mr. President, the people of Virginia are most fortunate to be represented in the Senate by a man of the character, the ability, the courage, the vision, and the effective and inspiring leadership of WILLIS ROBERTSON. I join with them in congratulating him on the high honor bestowed upon him in being selected to receive the Good Citizenship Medal of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF SPRINGFIELD, THE FORMER HOME OF PRESIDENT ZACHARY TAYLOR

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on February 16, 1966, the Kentucky House of Representatives passed a resolution memorializing the Congress to consider appropriate legislation to acquire Spring-

field, the former home of Gen. Zachary Taylor, the 12th President of the United States, and to acquire additional acreage for the expansion of the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, both of which are located in my State of Kentucky.

The Honorable Troy B. Sturgill, chief clerk of the house of representatives, has forwarded me a copy of this resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution No. 79, adopted by the Kentucky House of Representatives on February 16, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOUSE RESOLUTION 79

Resolution memorializing Gen. Zachary Taylor

Whereas the remains of Gen. Zachary Taylor, the 12th President of the United States, and his beloved wife, Margaret, lie entombed in a beautiful marble mausoleum in the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery on the outskirts of Louisville, Jefferson County, Ky., surrounded by the graves of veterans from the Spanish American War to the wars of the present era; and

Whereas a small group of patriotic Kentuckians under the leadership of Mrs. C. D. Greer, of Louisville, as chairman of the Zachary Taylor Memorial Committee of the Outdoor Art League of Louisville, in 1921, undertook the task of beautifying the Zachary Taylor burial grounds, and to make of them a fitting resting place for this beloved soldier in the fall of 1922. The first step toward the development of the project was undertaken by the planting of pin oaks, and on March 10, 1924, the Kentucky legislature enacted a bill which was signed by Gov. William J. Fields, requiring the State of Kentucky to deed to Jefferson County that part of the Zachary Taylor burial grounds and road which had been deeded to the State in 1881 by Mr. George McCurdy, and on April 22, 1924, Jefferson County appropriated \$10,000 for the building of a roadway leading to the burial grounds. In June of 1924, the Honorable Maurice Thatcher, Member of Congress from Louisville and Jefferson County, introduced a bill in the Congress calling for an annual appropriation for the maintenance of the grounds, the bill was enacted by the Congress and signed by President Calvin Coolidge on February 24, 1925.

Thus was established the Zachary Taylor National Shrine, and in 1926, the Kentucky Legislature enacted a bill which was signed by Gov. William J. Fields, appropriating funds for the purchase of 15 acres of ground surrounding the Zachary Taylor burial grounds, which was promptly purchased and deeded to the U.S. Government for the establishment of the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, and was so dedicated on May 31, 1928. The dedicatory address was delivered by the Honorable Maurice Thatcher, Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District of Kentucky, who began his address with these glowing words:

"We are here today to dedicate this lovely mausoleum which shall hold through the indefinite future, all that remains of the sacred dust of that splendid Kentuckian, that great American, that splendid soldier and citizen, Zachary Taylor, the 12th President of the United States."; and

Whereas Gen. Zachary Taylor, affectionately called "Old Rough and Ready" by the officers and soldiers who served with him out of respect for his courageous and energetic leadership, was born on November 24, 1784, in Montebello, Orange County, Va., and a year later migrated with his family to Jefferson

County, Ky., and thus truly became an early Kentucky pioneer. In 1806, Gen. Zachary Taylor volunteered for the Army which he served for 40 years. When the war with England broke out in 1812, Taylor, a major, was sent with 50 men to the defense of Fort Harrison on the Wabash River in Indiana, where on September 4, 1812, Indians led by Tecumseh furiously attacked and after 7 hours of hard fighting they were forced to flee in disorder. As a colonel, Taylor, in 1832 participated in the Black Hawk campaign, and for the defeat of the Seminoles in the Battle of Okechobee in December 1837, he was brevetted brigadier general, and in 1840, General Taylor was promoted to command the southern division of the western department of the Army.

As commander of the Army of the Rio Grande, General Taylor, on March 6, 1846, was instructed to march to the Rio Grande, which was recognized by the United States as the southern boundary of Texas, but rejected by Mexico, and his first encounter with the Mexicans occurred on May 8, 1846, at Palo Alto, followed the next day by the battle of Resaca de la Paloma. General Taylor defeated the Mexicans in this and the war with Mexico was begun.

On September 21, 1846, General Taylor marched on Monterey, the chief stronghold in northern Mexico. General Ampudia, the Mexican commander, proposed surrender and terms were agreed on, then late in the autumn of 1846, General Santa Anna with a large army marched against General Taylor, who had taken a position near Buena Vista, on February 22, 1847.

General Santa Anna made a demand upon General Taylor for surrender, which was promptly refused and battle ensued, and just before the battle, General Taylor addressed his troops, "Soldiers, I intend to stand here not only so long as a man remains, but so long as a piece of a man is left." By nightfall the Mexicans were fleeing in confusion. With a force one-fourth the size of the enemy, General Taylor had won his greatest victory and won the Mexican War.

In 1848 General Taylor was elected President of the United States and was inaugurated on March 5, 1849. On July 4, 1850, President Taylor, while attending a ceremony connected with the building of the George Washington Monument, became ill and died July 9, 1850, and shortly thereafter he was brought to Kentucky and interred in the Taylor family burial ground, now the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, neglected and almost forgotten by the Nation until the Outdoor Art League of Louisville in 1921 initiated their plan for the establishment of a Zachary Taylor National Shrine; and

Whereas the 15 acres acquired by the State of Kentucky and deeded to the U.S. Government for the establishment of a Zachary Taylor National Shrine and Cemetery is now completely filled with the remains of servicemen and their families and 63 members of the Zachary Taylor family and 200 slaves, and unless additional acreage is obtained the cemetery will be permanently closed to servicemen and their families forever; and

Whereas the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery is an important link in the system of national military cemeteries in this country, and the closing of this cemetery will create and cause great hardship to the families of countless number of veterans and servicemen desiring to be interred in Kentucky, especially in the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery; the national cemetery should not only be enlarged for cemetery purposes but the home of Zachary Taylor, Springfield, adjacent to Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, should be acquired for a national shrine and become a part of the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery thus making the cemetery and the home a national shrine; and

Whereas Springfield, the home of Gen. Zachary Taylor for the first 23 years of his life, now 175 years old, built by General Taylor's father upon moving to Kentucky from Virginia, situated on Apache Road, in an excellent state of preservation, privately owned, the owners having indicated, as reported in an article appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal on Sunday, January 24, 1960, that they would make the home available to the Government if assured it would become a part of a shrine, that this home stands near the Old Taylor Burial Grounds and now the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, and that Time magazine reported recently that the National Park Service is considering a systematic survey to insure that at least one residence for each President will be preserved; and

Whereas it appears that the memory of the life and exploits of Kentucky's greatest military leader and 12th President of the United States is not well known to many of us and forgotten generally by the public, hence, it behooves us, in reverence and everlasting appreciation for the accomplishments of Gen. Zachary Taylor, for his leadership and services in making a great contribution to this Nation, which greatly helped in the formation of our United States as we have it today, and that the acquirement of his old home, Springfield, for a national shrine and for the expansion of the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, where he will be surrounded by honored veterans of the wars of the United States, will, indeed, be helpful and a fitting way of rendering a needed service to our service men and women and the Veterans of our armed forces, and in preserving the memory of Gen. Zachary Taylor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, (1) That the foregoing resolution in respect to General and former President of the United States, the Honorable Zachary Taylor, that the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is memorialized to consider appropriate legislation to acquire Springfield, the former home of Gen. Zachary Taylor and to acquire additional acreage for the expansion of the Cemetery;

(2) That the clerk of the house be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the Lieutenant Governor, speaker of the house of representatives, Kentucky Members of the U.S. Congress, the chairmen of the House Military Affairs and Veterans' Affairs Committees of the U.S. Congress, a copy to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the Interior, urgently soliciting their support in the accomplishment of the purpose of this resolution—the acquisition of Springfield, and additional acreage for the expansion of Zachary Taylor National Cemetery.

PARTNERS IN AIR SAFETY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, for the pilot or air traveler, weather is an all-important consideration. The need for information about the weather is endless.

Thanks to the efforts of the Weather Bureau, which compiles the necessary data, and of Federal Aviation Agency personnel, who disseminate the information, our pilots are better equipped to complete their flights without mishap.

Perhaps in no other State of the Union is the cooperation between the FAA and Weather Bureau more appreciated. Not only is Alaska the "flyingest" of the 50 States, but its weather varies from heavy

rains in sections of southeast Alaska to whiteout conditions in the Arctic.

Mr. President, as an article prepared by the FAA reports, the cooperation is the result of formalized agreements between the FAA and the Environmental Science Service Administration. So that others may learn of this partnership in air safety I ask unanimous consent that the FAA article be printed in the RECORD.

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

PARTNERS IN AIR SAFETY

"Everyone talks about the weather, but nobody does anything about it," said Charles Warner, the editor of the Hartford, Conn., Courant back in 1890.

Seventy-five years later, man still can do very little about the weather—but he knows a lot more about what causes thunderstorms, blizzards, rain, snow, and other weather phenomena. On the ground he can take shelter. For a pilot, however, weather takes on a much fuller meaning. He must share the airspace with it everytime he flies. It is his safety and that of his passengers which is of mutual concern to the Federal Aviation Agency and the Environmental Science Service Administration (Weather Bureau) of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Working together as partners in air safety, it is their job to present the best available aviation weather information—current and forecast—to the pilot when he comes to a Weather Bureau airport station or to a flight service station for a weather briefing, or calls in for this information from his airplane.

This cooperation between FAA and ESSA is not a loose arrangement. It has been formalized by agreements in the past between CAA, FAA, and the Weather Bureau. A new interagency agreement signed by FAA Administrator William F. McKee and Commerce Secretary John T. Connors last August updated all previous agreements and working arrangements in the areas of aviation weather services and meteorological communications. Evaluation of weather information from many sources and forecasting continues to be ESSA's responsibility. FAA is responsible for distributing this information through its extensive communications facilities, and, where flight service stations are located, air traffic control specialists now display and present aviation weather to pilots.

FAA-ESSA teamwork has been developed to a high degree throughout the United States. In Alaska, teamwork between employees of both agencies and their families on and off the job is a way of life. Located at 13 airports, they serve pilots in the flyingest State in the Union, where 1 in 50 inhabitants holds a pilot's license, where for many the airplane is the only means of transportation, and where some of the world's most difficult weather to predict tests a forecaster's mettle. Torrential rains in the southeast panhandle, high winds and fog banks in the Aleutian Island chain, heavy snows and severe low temperatures in the interior and the whiteout conditions in the Arctic are examples of the extremes of weather FAA personnel and their ESSA counterparts have to contend with during the year.

King Salmon, a small community situated about 300 miles southwest of Anchorage, is a typical example of where excellent rapport and teamwork exist between FAA and ESSA in Alaska.

Carl E. Fundeen, FAA area manager, and John B. Baker, ESSA meteorological technician in charge, and their personnel work in a modern flight service station—a one-story structure commissioned in June 1963. Station life at the King Salmon FSS resembles

that of typical stations in the rest of the United States. There are a few interesting exceptions, however. FAA performs plant maintenance for the Weather Bureau personnel which includes everything from repairing teletype equipment, maintaining motor vehicles, fixing plumbing and electrical wiring in living quarters in Government-furnished homes a short distance from the FSS, and just about anything else that needs fixing at the station.

Weather Chief John P. Baker assists Leonard L. Schornak and his air traffic control specialists maintain their proficiency in briefing pilots on the weather conditions—a function formerly performed by Weather Bureau forecasters. The new FAA-ESSA memorandum of agreement assigned to the FAA specialists the weather briefing responsibilities in the flight service station, and, at the same time, charged ESSA with establishing a quality control program to assure that there is no derogation of service.

The wives of the FAA-ESSA employees are also contributing their share to building the spirit of teamwork which is so evident to a visitor to King Salmon. Boredom and cabin fever are practically nonexistent as a result of social activities and programs they have organized for their husbands, youngsters, and themselves.

King Salmon is just one of the number of stations in Alaska where this interagency cooperation may be found. This cooperation is not restricted to Alaska: It exists throughout the United States wherever FAA and ESSA specialists are working together to help pilots and their passengers make their way through the airspace safely.

ACHIEVEMENT AND CHALLENGE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by my colleague, Senator ELLENDER, before the 20th annual convention of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, at New Orleans, La., on February 9.

This address is a concise and timely approach to a subject that is vital to the welfare of our country at this time.

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

ACHIEVEMENT AND CHALLENGE

(Address by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, before the 20th annual convention of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, New Orleans, La., February 9, 1966)

I am pleased to be with you tonight and take part in this, the 20th annual meeting of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. It gives me the opportunity to pay tribute to my good friend and your ardent supporter, Marlon Monk, and the other officers and directors of this great organization. It also gives me the opportunity to salute the soil conservation district officials for the admirable job you are doing in advancing soil and water conservation throughout America. Your work is just about the most important work anybody can do. You have dedicated yourselves to making this Nation a better place in which to live, work, and play. Your work in protecting and developing soil and water resources benefits all of us.

I have cooperated with you and have followed your progress since becoming a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1937. And the more I see, the more I have come to respect you. I well remember the deep gullies and eroded hills

that marred the Louisiana landscape before the soil conservation district movement got its start. At that time, no one believed that one day the scars would be healed and the land covered with grass and timber to become once again an economic asset to the community and the State. Those early investments in soil conservation have paid off handsomely and they will continue to pay off in the years ahead.

The growth of the soil conservation district movement in the United States is one of the most phenomenal developments of the past three decades. Since 1937 every State legislature has enacted a soil conservation district law. Some 3,000 soil conservation districts have been organized by local people to include some 97 percent of all the farms and ranches in this Nation.

More than 2 million farmers and ranchers are now cooperating with local soil conservation districts in practicing conservation farming. This is a record you can be proud of, and I commend you for it. You have successfully met many challenges—some of which were quite formidable.

What are the challenges of the future, and will you be equally successful in meeting them?

We all know much work remains to be done if we are to adequately develop our most vital natural resources—soil and water—so that they can be of maximum benefit to present and future generations of Americans.

We also know that getting the work done will be immeasurably more difficult because of the tremendous demands on our resources.

Population pressures, our technological revolution, and rapid urban growth feed voraciously on a diet of natural resources. Our rapidly growing population needs food, clothing, and shelter. It also needs roads and superhighways, factories and shopping centers, and outdoor recreation areas.

The basic requirement for all these needs is land and water, and here is where we meet the problem face to face. Our land area is limited, but the demands upon it are phenomenal. Yet we continue to fulfill these demands with reckless abandon.

A good deal of our most productive agricultural land now lies buried under superhighways, parking lots and housing developments, and the pace continues unabated. We continue to let our good productive land be absorbed in the squeeze and shuffle of urban development.

We are losing more than 1 million acres of agricultural land each year to satisfy non-agricultural needs. This cannot continue very long. The fact that we can presently produce more food than we can consume is no excuse for destroying the one natural resource without which we cannot live—that of productive land.

One indication of the importance of your work for future generations is the prediction that our present population of 192 million is expected to rise to 245 million by 1980 and more than 330 million in the year 2000.

For too many years we have neglected, abused, and destroyed our environment in quest of short-lived gains. The early exploiters who denuded our forest land and ripped up the grass-covered hills may have used the excuse that they knew no better. But we know better, and we continue to destroy our natural resources at a rate that would make the early exploiters blush.

For example, in California 375 acres of open farmland are ripped up by bulldozers each day to fill the nonagricultural needs of the 1,500 new citizens added daily to the State's population. That's 140,000 acres a year to satisfy the needs of a half million new citizens—and much of that land is the most productive to be found anywhere in the Nation.

Before long 2 percent of California's land area will be permanently sealed under ribbons of concrete and asphalt for highways alone—a sad footnote, indeed, to this affluent society. Of course, California, with its burgeoning population, isn't typical of all States. But its problem is an indication of what is to come in many areas.

At one time you had a single primary objective—erosion control. Now your objectives reach into just about every facet of natural resource development.

You saw the need for the watershed approach to conservation and the need for a tailor-made conservation program for the high-risk farming area of the Great Plains. And the Federal Government saw fit to supply you with the tools to accomplish these early goals. You've made excellent use of both Public Law 566 and Public Law 1021.

The Great Plains conservation program has been an outstanding success. More than 20,000 contracts have been signed on 40.3 million acres of land. Those in the program plan to convert 1.3 million acres from cropland to more stable vegetation. And there's a backlog of 4,200 waiting to get into the program.

Also very successful is the small watershed program, which in a little more than a decade has established itself as an essential part of our total water resource development work, including the downstream activities in our major basins such as the mighty Mississippi. Through a series of congressional amendments the small watershed program has evolved from one strictly for flood prevention to one that embraces the resource needs of all the people in the community.

Successful projects have boosted rural economies in several ways and in many cases a successful watershed project has been the key to new industry, increased employment, and a broadened economic base for the entire community.

Nationally 709 projects are completed or under construction and an additional 463 are in the planning stage. A total of 1,228 applications from local groups for help in watershed development are awaiting action. The popularity of this program is certainly reflected in this tremendous response.

The latest step in broadcasting your conservation concept has been the pilot Resource Conservation and Development projects. Ten of these projects are under construction and another ten have been approved for planning assistance.

In 1962 Secretary of Agriculture Freeman challenged you at your annual meeting to broaden your district programs and update your memorandums of understanding with the Department of Agriculture. To date, 2,153 of the 3,000 districts have done this.

It is with pride I report that Louisiana is one of the 11 States in which all districts have updated their agreements.

I have reviewed this progress merely to show that you have not been standing still. That in the face of population pressures and urban growth, you have been seeking new avenues to accelerate proper resources development.

I believe you can do much more. Indeed, you must do more.

If soil and water conservation is to keep pace with the Nation's growth, it must take on larger goals, and perhaps even new direction. However much we respect and revere the past, we must not permit our nostalgia for the good old days to deter us from seeing the problem of conservation in the realities of 1966.

Soil and water conservationists must look beyond the countryside if they wish to fulfill their hopes and dreams for an abundance of clear water and fertile soil. The active support and assistance of urban people are

absolutely necessary if we are to achieve our goals. You must convince them and, at the same time, be convinced yourselves, that the rural countryside and the cities are mutually dependent upon each other. In a modern industrial and agricultural nation such as the United States, urban and rural areas exist symbiotically and it is this position of mutual support which must be brought home to all segments of our society.

Modern agriculture demands an industrial counterpart and, of course, it goes without saying that urban people could not exist without food, clothing and shelter provided from the country. Proper conservation measures must be applied in cities and suburban areas if there is to be any real conservation of rural lands and waters.

If anyone doubts the truth of these statements, he need only take the special case of Lake Erie. Today Lake Erie, far from being one of our Great Lakes, is a depository for chemicals, refuse, sewerage and other debris, because proper conservation measures were not applied in the cities and suburban areas bordering its shores. The problems which have faced these cities and suburban areas have been so overwhelming in magnitude that it was not possible for the local officials alone to cope with the waste and spoilage which are byproducts of an industrial society. Little or no attention was given to cleaning up the atmosphere, to purifying the water and to conserving the soil.

The magnitude of the problem of conservation is larger than the local area. It has been estimated that the cost of restoring Lake Erie will amount to several billion dollars. The polluted rivers and streams which feed into this great lake also must be cleaned up. The task facing the American people, in not only preserving, but in recovering that which is almost lost, is staggering. Many areas of our country have become junkyards and dumps for the disposition of our waste and refuse.

The warnings have been raised to rural Americans. Enlist the support and aid of urban Americans in order that both may be preserved, or lose everything for which you have been fighting for 30 years. State Legislatures will no longer be dominated by rural interests, and if more attention is not immediately paid to the problems of the urban dweller, he is most likely to ignore the problems of rural America when he becomes the complete master of the political process. Conservationists must rid themselves of their parochial attitudes and must see conservation in its broader sense; that all America, both city and country, must be preserved if the American civilization is to endure.

If modern Americans are to face up to the challenge of the last part of this century, and let me remind you that only 34 years are left, they must put aside ancient dualisms and cleavages which have polarized our Nation. The old conflicts of Jefferson versus Hamilton, country versus city and agriculture versus industry must once and for all be settled and put aside. It will take all of the energies of the American people, both urban and rural, pulling together to solve the problems of the conservation and preservation of the natural resources of this Nation.

In order to accomplish the objectives which modern conservation demands, some hard decisions will have to be made. Choices will have to be made—regulation of industry or polluted streams and rivers; navigation or salt water intrusion; seasonal floods or natural beauty in the wild state. I only pose these as examples of alternatives facing the people.

The drainage of vast lowland areas in Louisiana has radically altered the water tables in many areas of my State. This,

of course, has not only affected cultivated lands, but has also affected the wildlife and fishing industry. Laws restricting the use of land and water are going to be necessary, even to a point which we perhaps cannot now envision, if we are to succeed in conserving these resources.

The issue boils down to this:

Can we provide sufficient water for our large urban populations, supply the need of water for our industries and our agriculture and, at the same time, have it in abundance in a more or less pure form for wildlife and recreation? I believe we can have an abundance of clean water and fertile soil for all of our needs if we begin to attack the problem in its entirety with a united purpose, and with the aid of all the American people.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, and member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I have sponsored and supported legislation concerning resource conservation. And I am proud of the support my committees, the Senate, and the House of Representatives gave this past year to resource development work.

Briefly, Congress increased Soil Conservation Service funds for fiscal year 1966 by \$9.5 million over the previous year which will aid in staffing new soil conservation districts with technical personnel, speed up work in the small watershed program, permit the signing of additional contracts through the Great Plains conservation program, and permit authorization of 10 new resource conservation and development projects for planning assistance.

Congressional committees approved 80 new watershed projects for operations. This with the 20 approved by the SCS Administrator, set a new record for projects approved.

Congress also amended Public Law 566, authorizing an increase in flood storage capacity in project reservoirs from 5,000 to 12,500 acre-feet.

In addition Congress passed the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which, among other things, provides for water development and for conservation contracts for erosion control and land use changes.

The cropland adjustment program included in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 will encourage farmers to develop conservation practices to increase wildlife.

There were other proposals that, fortunately, didn't get considered. One I'm sure you heard of was to reduce the Soil Conservation Service's conservation operations fund by \$20 million and charge the farmers and ranchers for half the cost of technical services in layout and design.

As a matter of fact, the Department of Agriculture recently sent up a suggested bill on the subject, requesting me, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to introduce it. I want to tell you that I have refused to do so, even on the so-called by request basis in my capacity as chairman. Furthermore, if someone else does introduce such a measure, it will have to come before my committee, and I pledge to you that I will do everything in my power to see that it is defeated.

Your association's soil stewardship advisory committee has picked for this year's theme "Crisis in the Countryside." No more fitting title could have been selected. For we are truly facing a crisis in the countryside—one which you must share a great deal of the responsibility in meeting.

You can help meet this crisis by speaking out on the vital issues at stake, by carrying the word of resource conservation into the urban areas, the city councils, the State legislatures, and the National Government.

The cause of conservation is crying out for more men to speak on the misuse and

abuse of our heritage of soil and water. It is crying out for those who believe in the stewardship of the soil to make their needs known in a convincing manner. Your national association should be forceful, resourceful, and original in making budget requests before congressional committees. Your State associations should take the same firm stand with your legislatures, and local soil and water conservation districts should do the same with county governments.

Your knowledge is one of the most important and most powerful assets you have. Use it in your effort to guide the development and use of our natural resources along wise and orderly lines.

In closing let me again commend you for the work you are doing. The challenges ahead are great, for we know the facts and they are alarming.

The cause of conservation needs you now as never before.

HOUSTON ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM THREATENED BY LACK OF FUNDS FROM WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most successful programs in my home State of Texas, under the war on poverty, is the Houston Adult Basic Education program for which more than 5,200 people enrolled, when only 500 were expected. And if allowed to expand 10,000 to 15,000 could be expected.

Despite its success, the program is now threatened because its allocation of funds have been cut. On February 14, 1966, I sent the following letter to the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity entreating him to reexamine the worthiness of this program:

HON. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: The 1966 Office of Economic Opportunity budget which you presented to Congress called for an expenditure of \$30 million for the adult basic education program. Congress appropriated the full amount which you requested.

Subsequently only \$16 million was allotted by your office to the Office of Education for running this program. The State of Texas, and many other States, I am advised, made their plans for fiscal year 1966 on the assumption that the amount called for in the budget and the amount appropriated by Congress would actually be available. Now, since only a little more than half of this amount has been allotted to these States, many of the programs to which they had made commitments will have to cease operation unless the cuts are restored.

I need not point out the damage which will be done to the people's attitude toward these programs if in the first year of real operation they are abruptly curtailed. Neither the people running them nor those participating will have confidence in adequate funds for the future.

An example of what will happen unless more funds are made available is the situation confronting the Houston adult basic education program. This endeavor, which has an enrollment of 5,122 adults, will have to be terminated very soon unless it gets additional funds. This has been a very successful program, initiated by the people themselves. They come two nights a week for 2½ hours per night. They learn simple mathematics and how to read and write English. One of the teachers has written me: "We are using a book provided by the Government called 'My Country'; it is a simple

and direct presentation of how our Government works, how it started, and what it means to be an American citizen. Now I must tell them that their Government's promises were false and that their hopes are empty."

I sincerely entreat you to reexamine this matter. I am sure that you will see the worthiness of this endeavor and the desirability of providing adequate funds.

Sincerely,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

Mr. President, I am pleased to see that the Office of Education has reevaluated the needs of this program and has been able to raise the Texas allotment for the adult basic education program by an additional \$1,290,066 as of February 25, 1966. This is a much deserved refunding and may serve to prevent the disappointments of the Houston program as pointed out in the article entitled, "Will Success Spoil a Poverty Program," from the February 26, 1966, New Republic, which I ask unanimous consent to be printed in the RECORD.

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

WILL SUCCESS SPOIL A POVERTY PROGRAM?

HOUSTON.—Until bureaucrats turned off the tap, a program here to teach reading and writing had the city dazzled. Texans are not overly fond of Federal efforts to raise up the poor, but no one, rich or poor, quarreled with this one. The vocational department of the Houston school system, which ran the "basic adult education" program, had expected no more than 500 students. More than a thousand enrolled for classes last fall; by this February there were more than 5,200.

Such an enthusiastic response chipped at a comfortable Texas stereotype of the lazy poor who deserve what they haven't got. The classes offered no credit and hard work; they meet two nights a week for 3 hours, at the end of the working day. Teachers enlisted from the public schools drilled the students in reading, writing, and arithmetic. Organized by achievement into three levels, the students had only to meet one formal entrance requirement—no more than an 8th-grade education. Most classes were held in public school buildings and civic centers, but to take care of the unexpected crowds, a union hall and a fire station were commandeered.

The teachers, many of whom had volunteered to earn an extra \$10 a night, were surprised to find themselves working with the most eager pupils they had ever encountered. "If they ever stopped this program I don't know what I'd do," one young Latin American student told his teacher. "This is the first chance I've ever had." "Of all the things I've ever done," a teacher remarked, "this is the only one that I've known was right. It takes a lot of guts when you're 50 years old to admit that you can't read and all these people get is the satisfaction of seeing themselves improve." One man had enrolled because he had a job waiting that required him to read and write. A grandmother enrolled because she wanted to be able to read the Bible herself before she died. Illiterates in the first level made astonishing progress.

On her third night of class, one woman teacher was presented with an orchid. At Christmas, the adults asked to have parties at their "school." After presents, the class brought out its tamales, cokes, apples, chili.

Then in mid-January, the Federal ax fell. The allocation for the Houston program was cut from \$240,000 to \$188,000 for the entire

year. The superintendent of schools, discovering that this money would be eaten up by February 4, decided to abandon the program.

Ironically, it was success coupled with bureaucratic affection for paper budgets that caused the kill order to be given. The program was paid for out of poverty funds made available through the Economic Opportunity Act; but because it was educational, the Office of Economic Opportunity passed the funds along to the Office of Education, which in turn made grants to State education agencies.

Somewhere in this tangle of requisitions and agencies, the human purpose of the expenditure seems to have been lost. Of last year's \$19 million Federal allocation to Houston, only \$4 million had been used, because the program started late. And somehow, in the face of an unexpected crush of students, it was decided that less was needed this year than last; so the original \$19 million was cut to \$16 million. The OEO claimed that the Bureau of the Budget had done the slicing; the Office of Education claimed that the OEO had been in on it; and with a magical abacus, some officials explained that the reduction was really an increase, because last year's leftover money and this year's new money added up to \$30 million. What in fact happened was that the Office of Education, confronted with an enormous turnout of eager illiterates and semilliterates, ordered each State to cut back its local allocations by 15 percent. Classes were swollen because the program was effective. If the poverty and education officials had not blundered into one of the most desperate needs of the poor, the program would not have been cut back. Since the amount of Federal money was determined on a per capita basis, the need of the poor exceeded the resources available.

Among the students in Houston, excitement and hope gave way to bitter disappointment. To educational administrators, however, it was all part of the game. "It's merely a reduction from what was originally allocated," said an official of the Texas education agency. "School people are used to that."

The city, impressed for once with its hard-working poor, failed to sympathize with this "administrative readjustment." Scores of churches and clubs called for volunteers to teach or raise money and offered space in which the classes could meet. There were individual offers of donations and talk of a fundraising campaign to allow the Houston school system to keep on without the undependable Federal Government. Many teachers said they would work for nothing.

At last, 2 weeks ago, a local foundation staked the poor to what the poverty program couldn't supply, a check for \$54,000. The money wasn't enough, for the classes must now be restricted to students already enrolled. It is estimated by school officials that between 10,000 and 15,000 would have signed up, if they could have been accommodated; more than 160,000 people here have not finished the eighth grade.

—William P. Pannill.

THE WAR AGAINST CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last week I made available for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first portion of an outstanding report on the John Birch Society which was recently compiled by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and I indicated my plan to offer the other sections of this report from time to time.

Today, I ask unanimous consent that the second section of this fine report be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WAR AGAINST CIVIL RIGHTS

The major development in the John Birch Society's centrally directed program during 1965 was the launching of an all-out drive against the civil rights movement.

The assault started in May, with the publication of a pamphlet by Welch himself which laid down the ideological line. Five hundred thousand copies of a 16-page document called "Two Revolutions at Once" were distributed to the Birch army across the country—100 copies to every Birch Society cell.

In mobilizing his troops, Welch made it crystal clear that the campaign upon which they were embarking was the single most important undertaking of the John Birch Society in its entire 7-year history.

"Fully expose the 'civil rights' fraud," said Welch in May 1965, "and you will break the back of the Communist conspiracy."

In "Two Revolutions at Once," Welch set forth his view that the Negro civil rights movement in America was part of a worldwide, Communist-dominated, anticolonialism revolution that used the slogans of freedom, independence, and self-determination. At the same time, he said, it was part of the Communist-led revolutionary movement against capitalism in the United States itself.

In his analysis, Welch likened the Negro rights movement in the United States to various "national liberation fronts" in Asia and Africa which in his view have been sparked by Communist terror tactics. He claimed that Algeria's "murderous guerrilla band" * * * given the high-sounding title of the "Federation of National Liberation"—or FNL—was merely "a preview of what the NRM—the Negro revolutionary movement—will do to the people of the South."

OLD COMMUNIST BOOKLETS

The relationship between the allegedly Communist-led national liberation movements abroad and the Negro revolutionary movement in the United States was revealed, Welch said, in a booklet published by the American Communists in 1928. Called "American Negro Problems," it referred to the southern Negroes as "virtually a colony within the body of the United States of America," and called for the establishment of a "Negro Soviet Republic" in the South.

In fact, this 37-year-old Red propaganda line was repudiated by the Communist Party's 1959 convention—because it had already died in the Red failure to win the American Negro to the Communist cause.

The Birch Society, nevertheless, continues to distribute thousands of copies of the 1928 Communist booklet to support its theme—that the efforts for civil rights equality and for racial desegregation are Communist-inspired and subversive.

Another Red booklet—published in 1935 and entitled "Negroes in a Soviet America"—is also being distributed by the Birch Society. It was originally reprinted by the National Economic Council under its late founder, Merwin K. Hart, a well-known American anti-Semite. Before his death a few years ago, Hart was the leader of Birch Society Chapter 26 in New York; his publications were recommended by Welch to Birch Society members in its early days.

In the June bulletin, Welch said:

"Our task must be simply to make clear that the movement known as civil rights is Communist-plotted, Communist-controlled, and in fact * * * serves only Communist

purposes. So let's keep our activities and efforts concentrated on this central undertaking."

He added:

"Make yourself as much of an authority on the whole 'civil rights' segment of the total conspiracy as you can. * * * We are asking for, and counting on, a very heavy concentration of effort by our total membership during the next few months, to support our belief that the civil rights drive and the parallel Negro revolutionary movement constitute the most vulnerable point for attack."

IDEOLOGICAL WEAPONS

There were many weapons which Welch mobilized for the ideological warfare against the civil rights movement to which he had committed his propaganda army. For example, there were published materials. One was a book published by the Birchers' own Western Islands Co. It was written by Alan Stang of the Birch stable of writers, was called "It's Very Simple," and was essentially a popularized version of the Welch ideology on the Communist character of the civil rights movement. The book had an initial printing of 100,000 copies and sold out in the first few weeks. An additional 200,000 were printed soon thereafter, and more were on order as 1965 drew to a close.

Stang wrote that America's race problem and the effort of the civil rights movement to end it were both planned by the Communists, built up by the Communists and, most important, conducted by the Communists. Describing the Negro movement as a "social revolution" aimed at destroying capitalism, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as a major step toward a Washington dictatorship, Stang concluded his polemic by declaring:

"I accuse the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King of being in effect one of the country's most influential workers for communism against the Negroes. I accuse President Kennedy and President Johnson of knowing this but nevertheless, not only closing their eyes to it, but lending a hand. I therefore accuse them of having betrayed their oath of office."

There were also printed flyers (suitable for use as full-page newspaper ads) asking "What's Wrong With Civil Rights?" followed by: "The answer is, nothing. But there is a great deal wrong with what is being done today in the name of civil rights."

Birch ads declared that the Negroes' problem was exaggerated, that the civil rights movement was not simply "infiltrated" by Communists, but actually "created" by them. Birch postal cards were distributed. One showed Martin Luther King at the Highlander Folk School, in Tennessee, which the Birchers and radical rightists have branded as a Communist training school. (King appeared there briefly on Labor Day weekend, 1957, to make a speech.)

Another postcard pictured a man identified by the Birchers as the founder of the civil rights movement. They described him as a Hungarian Communist who used such names as Joseph Pogany, John Schwartz, Joseph Lang, and John Pepper. They said he arrived in the United States in 1922 and in 1928 wrote the pamphlet, American Negro Problems, which laid down the Red line for establishment of the Negro revolutionary movement. Aside from the dubious Welchian history, the drawing of Pogany-Schwartz-Lang-Pepper was reminiscent of some of the viciously anti-Jewish caricatures that appeared in Der Stuermer during the Nazi era in Germany and of similar caricatures that have been circulated in anti-Semitic ideological circles in the United States.

These recent materials were added to the arsenal of anticivil rights propaganda which the Birch Society had been using for some time. Its "Civil Rights Packet" already in-

cluded "Color, Communism, and Common-sense" by the late Negro ex-Communist, Manning Johnson, and Welch's "Letter to the South" which first appeared some years ago. Also available were various reprints, all hewing to the Birch line that the civil rights movement is a Communist manifestation, lock, stock, and barrel.

THE TACT COMMITTEES

The campaign for this nationwide attack was created by Welch in July 1965, with a proposed new and major approach to exposure of the fraud known as civil rights. He called for "the setting up throughout the country of hundreds of local or regional ad hoc committees for the specific purpose of telling the truth about the civil turmoil." Anticipating that they would come to be known as TACT—Truth About Civil Turmoil—he gave the shorthand name his blessing.

TACT front groups sprang up and swung immediately into high gear, distributing literature, holding meetings, sponsoring lectures by American opinion speakers, buying full-page ads in local newspapers, and peppering the letters-to-the-editors columns with Birch propaganda exposing the "truth about civil turmoil."

Welch's choice of the Communist-style front-group technique worked admirably. Many non-Birchite rightists and conservatives were lured into making common cause with the Birchers against the civil rights movement. In many localities, even the newspapers and other media of public information were at first unaware that the TACT committees were Birch fronts. For example:

In Fort Wayne, Ind., the News Sentinel reported the formation of the local TACT committee and merely noted that it had been formed to provide information about past instances of civil turmoil in order to prevent recurrences. There was not a hint in the news report of the TACT group's real sponsorship.

In the suburban Glenview-Northbrook area of Chicago, where a TACT committee was formed, the local newspaper reported that the committee chairman had said that the group, conservative in nature, is not connected with any organization. Yet the group's own newspaper advertisement was signed: "The TACT Committee of Northbrook and Glenbrook Division of the John Birch Society."

But the TACT committees around the country were not the only fronts spearheading the Birch Society's ideological warfare against civil rights.

The Detroit Committee for the Prevention of Racial Disorder listed the same post office box number as the local Birchite "support your local police" organization, and the same individual was listed as chairman of both.

In La Punta, Calif., Citizens for the Support of Law and Order seized on the Watts riots in Los Angeles, in the summer of 1965, to distribute a flyer captioned "Now Will You Believe?" It was, in effect, an advertisement for Stang's book and bore the "support your local police" emblem.

A woman in Whittier, Calif., received a letter from the Committee for Better Understanding which listed a post office box in racially troubled Selma, Ala. The letter ended with: "Yours for less government, more individual responsibility, and a better world," the slogan of the John Birch Society.

While waging war against the civil rights movement, the John Birch Society has, at the same time, diligently sought to create a public image of itself as friendly to Negroes. A mainstay of the Birch speakers' bureau during 1965 was Mrs. Julia Brown, a Negro lady who had once been a Communist and later an informant for the Government. More

recently, the American Opinion Speakers' Bureau listed conservative Negro newspaper columnist George Schuyler as one of its lecturers. Birch spokesmen go out of their way to make it clear that the society has Negro members. As part of the campaign to rid itself of any anti-Negro stigma, the society has established a Manning Johnson scholarship for deserving Negro students.

EXPLOITING RACIAL TENSIONS

Nevertheless, the Birchers seek to exploit racial tensions, unrest, and disorders for their own purposes. Forty-eight hours after the Watts riots in Los Angeles in the summer of 1965, Birch chapters were mobilized—via a directive to all area chapter leaders—for an intensive anticivil rights propaganda drive to exploit the white reaction to the outburst of violence and disorder.

It is inevitable that, like the Communists, the Birchers will seek in this way to exploit racial tensions and outbursts of violence. During 1965, Birch propaganda had much to say about the Selma civil rights march, some of it indistinguishable from the outpourings of openly racist organizations in the Deep South.

In the June 1965 issue of American Opinion, Writer Jim Lucier described the Selma march as having been organized by the international conspiracy of evil. An unsigned article in the July issue purported to describe what happened "when a horde of termites from all over the country, led by half-crazed ministers and professors, swarmed over the small town of Selma, Ala., in a typical demonstration of Communist activism."

It would be hard to finger such explosive educational prose as a direct cause of violence in the South but it is equally difficult to see in it any indication of an attempt to restore the racial harmony which Robert Welch, born and raised on a North Carolina farm, claims existed in the past.

WELCH'S HAPPY VISION

Welch has described such visions. In the June 1965, Bulletin, he wrote of "that huge reservoir of good will between the races that was such a happy circumstance of American life only two decades ago." And in a recent television interview he saw that period (a time of Negro second-class citizenship and enforced Jim Crow vassalage) as having included "a very, very tiny amount of injustice."

Such may be the cornerstone of the racial attitudes the John Birch Society is building; the happy circumstance was one of segregation and inequality.

The quarrel of the Birch Society with the concept of Negro equality goes far deeper than mere questions of politics and methods, or even of the alleged Communist character of the civil rights movement itself.

In "the Blue Book" of the society, Welch decried democracy as "merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagogery, and a perennial fraud." In a footnote he added that democracy was "the worst of all forms of government."

Jim Lucier, a frequent contributor to American Opinion, argued in the June 1965, issue that (1) Voting is not one of the basic rights of a human being; (2) there is no direct relationship between voting and freedom; and (3) the doctrine of majority rule is alien to American political tradition and ideals.

In the November 1964 issue, National Council Member Revilo P. Oliver, described by Welch as "quite possibly the world's greatest living scholar," wrote that it was a lie that the races are equal.

In the February 1965 issue, National Council Member Tom Anderson wrote that "the right to discriminate is the right to choose and the right to choose is the essence of liberty."

TAINTED SOURCES

Welch and those who wage war at his side are not always careful about the sources they cite to back up their contentions:

In the June 1965 Birch Bulletin for instance, Welch quoted "the long and prophetically accurate December 1965 Special Report of the American Flag Committee." The American Flag Committee had predicted 9 years earlier, he said, that 1965 was marked by the Communists as the target year for agitation for Negro voting rights. Welch devoted five full pages of the Bulletin to this report, and cited the American Flag Committee in five separate references.

The American Flag Committee was, in fact, a small-time propaganda outfit run by W. Henry MacFarland, Jr., of Philadelphia, an outspoken anti-Semite who toured the country some years ago with Gerald Smith, the anti-Jewish rabble rouser. MacFarland cooperated with the late Conde McGinley, Jew-bating publisher of Common Sense, and with the gutter level, racist, and anti-Semitic National Renaissance Party, headed by James Madole of New York, a minor pamphleteer and street corner agitator.

Welch's members had no way of knowing that two of the organizations founded by MacFarland before he created the American Flag Committee were included in the U.S. Attorney General's so-called list of subversive organizations. One was MacFarland's Nationalist Action League; the other, the Committee for Nationalist Action.

The July-August 1965, issue of American Opinion gave source credit, in an evaluation of racial questions, to the Councilor, a blatantly racist and openly anti-Semitic publication edited in Shreveport, La. by Ned Touchstone. The Councilor is the organ of the White Citizens Councils of Louisiana.

What of the John Birch Society and the Ku Klux Klans, now waging guerrilla race warfare in the American South? Welch and Society Public Relations Director John Rousselot have made it clear that Klan members are not welcome in the John Birch Society.

However, take the case of Dr. John R. Andrew of Stone Mountain, Ga. Andrew was the leader of the Birch Society's Emory (Atlanta) chapter until he resigned the position early in 1965 to run for political office. He is still a member of the society, and the Emory chapter still meets in his home. On August 23, 1965, Dr. Andrew addressed a rally of the Ku Klux Klan (United Klans of America) in Atlanta. He told the assembled Klansmen that he had been defeated in the special election for the reapportioned State legislature by the international banking conspiracy. Later, Andrew told a reporter for the Atlanta Journal that he was not actually a Klan member but would like to help the organization if he could.

Andrew was present on September 13, 1965, at the Henry Grady Hotel in Atlanta—as were Mr. and Mrs. George Birch (parents of John Birch) and other local society luminaries—to hear a speech by former Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker. During the question period, Walker, always proudly a Birch Society member, told a cheering audience:

"There will be a KKK in the U.S.A. longer than there will be an L.B.J."

When, on August 10, 1965, at Long Beach, Calif., Walker told his hearers of the Red plot aimed at "you, the white race—just 90 miles from Florida," he was giving perhaps the ultimate expression to the politico-racial fears that have emerged as the wellspring of John Birch Society activity.

PURPOSES

The stated purpose of the society's anti-civil rights campaign was set forth by Welch

in a July 1965, pamphlet entitled "A Stick of Dynamite." The society, he wrote, was not strong enough to fight a war, but it was strong enough to fight a battle and have a chance of success if it concentrated its forces on one front.

What are the true purposes of the society's all-out attack on the civil rights movement? It is a convenient instrument for exploiting whatever white backlash exists in the Nation as the result of the Negro thrust for equality.

The propaganda campaign is a logical preliminary to Welch's plan for a Birch Society effort in 1966 to influence the congressional elections.

The campaign offers an opportunity for nationwide activity by Birchers, using TACT and other front groups, and for recruiting new members into the society's ranks.

In short, like the Communists, the John Birch Society is seeking to exploit the Nation's racial tensions for its own propaganda and recruitment purposes, and for its deeper political goals. And it is using the Communist technique of the front group as a propaganda and recruiting instrument.

SUPPORT FOR STUDY OF CIA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the proposal made by Senator McCARTHY recently for a Foreign Relations Committee study of the role of the Central Intelligence Agency in foreign policy has drawn several favorable comments editorially. One newspaper making such editorial comments is the Evansville, Ind., Courier in its February 9 edition. In fact, the paper indicates its approval also for the bill offered by Senator Young of Ohio to establish a joint Senate-House Committee for continuing understanding of CIA operations.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Surveillance of CIA," be printed in the Congressional Record.

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

SURVEILLANCE OF CIA

Past efforts to bring the Central Intelligence Agency under some meaningful scrutiny by Congress has not gotten far. Those who espouse the CIA's viewpoint have thwarted such moves. Their central argument is that the CIA's effectiveness as a highly secret undertaking would be crippled if Congress were to ask embarrassing questions.

This argument has come up against some which are more than its match. The CIA is being called increasingly into question for its evident dabbling in foreign policy. Some of its clandestine operations are demonstrably not for the purpose of gathering intelligence, and sometimes constitute interference in the internal affairs of other nations.

This imperils the national interest of the United States. The fact that little is known about CIA operations, so that observers are forced into the tricky waters of conjecture, is in itself dangerous. Secret or not, the CIA should in reasonable measure be subject to the same rule that applies to all Federal agencies: it is the public's business, and the public has a right to know what it is up to.

It is against this background that one must consider two current attempts, by Senators STEPHEN M. YOUNG and EUGENE J. McCARTHY, to assert the congressional right of surveillance over the CIA as over the other agencies. Senator McCARTHY would clear the air with a "full and complete study," to be made by a Foreign Relations Subcommit-

tee, of how the CIA affects U.S. foreign relations. Young wants Congress to set up a permanent joint Senate-House committee to keep an eye on the intelligence agency. Both proposals have merit, and the first might indeed provide valuable guidelines for operation of a committee. Discreetly handled, surveillance by a committee would not hurt the CIA and might keep it from getting out of control.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

DEFUSING THE POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall send to the desk, at the conclusion of my remarks, on behalf of Senators GRUENING, CLARK, YARBOROUGH, NEUBERGER, HARTKE, and myself, two bills.

These bills deal with the subject of family planning at home and abroad. One bill would amend the Foreign Assistance Act and authorize the Agency for International Development to use U.S. holdings in foreign currencies to finance voluntary family planning programs in friendly foreign nations. The other authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make matching Federal grants to State, local, and private nonprofit organizations to enable them to provide family planning information and related medical assistance to individuals who desire these services but cannot afford to obtain them.

I ask unanimous consent that these bills be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that they lie on the table for 10 calendar days.

AMENDMENT NO. 489

I also send to the desk, on behalf of Senator GRUENING and myself, a proposed amendment to S. 2933, the President's food for freedom bill, which would authorize the use of foreign currencies accumulated through future sales of agricultural commodities to finance voluntary family planning programs in friendly foreign nations.

In view of the fact that the Committee on Agriculture begins hearings on S. 2933 tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, but that it be immediately referred to the Agriculture Committee, and not lie on the table for cosponsors.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is urgent need for the Congress to take decisive action to defuse the population explosion. We cannot pretend that this problem has nothing to do with the goals which our Nation is striving to foster both at home and abroad. We have made great sacrifices to help underdeveloped nations to improve their standards of life, yet hunger stalks the globe and the number of new mouths to feed outruns the ability of many nations, most notably India, to provide even a minimum diet. Indeed, the world food crisis has reached the point that U.S. production, even at full capacity, could not fill the gap in a few years.

At home we are seeking to attack the causes of poverty and crime, yet we know that the unwanted child of poor parents is the person least likely to break the cycle of poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, and despair—that he is the person most likely to become the burden and ultimately the enemy of society.

President Johnson has wisely said that finding effective but compassionate methods of curbing the population explosion is a cause second only to the search for peace.

The time is ripe for positive action. Ten years ago, even five years ago, this was a politically delicate subject. Today the Nation has awakened to the need for Government action.

The New York Times recently published the results of a poll conducted by the Gallup Organization, Inc. This poll, based upon an unusually large and carefully selected sample, shows that 63 percent of the American public favors U.S. Government aid to voluntary family planning programs and only 28 percent is opposed. It shows that 58 percent of all Americans favor such assistance to foreign governments, and only 34 percent are opposed. It shows that a majority of Catholics favor such assistance both at home and abroad. It also shows that 81 percent of Catholics and 86 percent of non-Catholics believe that family planning information should be easily available to any married couple which wants it. I ask unanimous consent that this article as well as a complete report on the Gallup survey be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TYDINGS. This change in public attitude has come about through the efforts of men who had the courage to brook the tides of public opinion. Senator CLARK is such a man. Senator GRUENING is such a man. So is President Johnson. Because of their leadership it is no longer necessary for an elected official to speak with trepidation on this subject. We have solid proof that a substantial majority of Americans feel it is a proper function of Government to provide family planning information and assistance to those, both at home and abroad, who explicitly request it.

The bills which I am introducing today would provide the funds and authority needed to make an impact on population

problems. They make two basic points unmistakably clear:

First. The Congress of the United States regards family planning as an area of great concern. We cannot turn away from the overriding social and economic issue of our time.

Second. In this delicate area, the Government will neither influence nor coerce its own citizens or foreign nationals to engage in family planning or to prefer any one method of family planning over any other method.

My bills contain careful safeguards to insure the integrity of conscience. The foreign bill provides that the Secretary of State shall approve a program "only if he has received satisfactory assurances that in the administration of the program the recipient nation will take reasonable precautions to insure that, first, no person will receive any family planning information, medical assistance, or supplies unless such person desires such services, and, second, the information, medical assistance, and supplies provided any recipient will not be inconsistent with the individual's expressed moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs."

The domestic bill provides that:

No grant shall be approved unless it contains and is supported by reasonable assurances that in carrying out any program assisted by any such grant, the applicant will establish and follow procedures designed to insure that—

(a) No individual will be provided with any information, medical assistance, or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

(b) No individual would be provided any medical assistance or supplies unless such individual has voluntarily filed a written request with the applicant asking for such medical assistance or supplies.

It is clear that under either bill any assistance to practicing Catholics would have to be consistent with their faith. Indeed, under the domestic bill, a Catholic hospital or welfare organization could qualify for Federal assistance to provide church-approved family planning assistance to Catholics. There are many great Catholic hospitals that now provide such church-approved family planning assistance. I know this to be true in my own State of Maryland.

In order to insure full access to individually preferred sources of assistance the bill specifically authorizes the Secretary to make grants to more than one organization in each community. Requirements for eligibility would be determined by the grant recipients. If additional safeguards to insure integrity of conscience are needed or desired I would be prepared to support them.

In other words, Mr. President, the domestic legislation gives effective initiative to State and local officials. They will plan their own programs. No bureaucrat in Washington can arbitrarily disqualify a program, unless it violates those specific guarantees of freedom of choice which the bill contains.

The population crisis is widely recognized throughout our society. The Catholic Church is currently engaged in a fundamental reexamination of its attitudes toward family planning. The Ford

and Rockefeller Foundations are spending millions of dollars to investigate and help resolve population problems.

Our great universities are devoting increased resources and attention to reproductive biology and family planning. I am particularly proud of the fact that the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore is one of America's outstanding centers for research and for the training of personnel in all aspects of family planning. The School of Public Health is now establishing a Department of Population and Family Health to undertake coordinated studies in reproductive biology, demography, and the motivational aspects of family planning.

The school's Division of International Health has a population unit and under grants from AID has trained some of the people who are helping foreign countries to set up national family planning programs. Prof. William McElroy of the university is a member of the President's Science Advisory Council with particular responsibility for family planning. He chaired the National Academy of Science committees which recently published such impressive studies on the growth of world and of U.S. population.

Until just a few years ago, the subject of overpopulation was politically taboo. As recently as 1959, our Government took the view expressed by President Eisenhower—that giving birth control information to foreign countries was "none of our business," though in the same year the Draper report warned that the world's population would soon outstrip man's ability to feed himself.

President Kennedy took the first steps in focusing official interest on family planning. He quietly authorized AID to consider requests for family planning information from foreign countries and encouraged research in this area by establishing the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

No one has done more to focus public attention on the population crisis than President Johnson. In his state of the Union message of 1965, he said:

I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources.

Later that year, he told the 20th anniversary of the United Nations that "less than \$5 invested in population control is worth \$100 invested in economic growth." In his state of the Union message last month, and in the foreign aid and health messages he has sent to Congress, the President has reaffirmed his intention of finding ways to deal with the population problem.

The first man to discuss family planning on the floor of the Senate was the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. On August 15, 1963, he introduced a Senate concurrent resolution, cosponsored by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], urging the President to step up population growth research at our National Institutes of Health and to create a Presidential Commission on Population. Last year, a decisive breakthrough was achieved when the Senator from Alaska [Mr.

GRUENING], introduced legislation which would set up the administrative machinery to deal with population problems. I am proud to be the first cosponsor of his bill, S. 1676.

Perhaps more important than the proposed legislation of the Senator from Alaska have been the pathbreaking hearings which he has conducted before his Foreign Aid Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. These hearings—held continuously throughout 1965—have served magnificently the cause of public education and citizen enlightenment. They have brought to the attention of the Nation the pressing need for action. They have documented conclusively the fact that a vast majority of citizens at home and throughout the world desire to practice family planning and desire to be responsible parents—but that many lack the information and assistance which would allow them to do so safely and effectively in accordance with their religious convictions. To date, more than 70 eminent witnesses have testified before the subcommittee of the Senator from Alaska. They include four Nobel Prize-winning scientists, Dr. Albert Lleras Camargo, former President of Colombia, and many of our most distinguished public servants, including Chester Bowles, Marriner Eccles, Stewart Udall, Kenneth Keating, James V. Bennett, former Director of the Bureau of Prisons, and others.

President Eisenhower, who today serves with President Truman as honorary cochairman of Planned Parenthood—World Population, sent the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] a most significant letter, in which he reversed the stand which he had taken earlier:

Ten years ago, although aware of some of these growing dangers abroad, I did not then believe it to be the function of the Federal Government to interfere with the social structure of other nations by using, except through private institutions, American resources to assist them in a partial stabilization of their numbers. I expressed this view publicly but soon abandoned it.

President Eisenhower continued:

If we now ignore the plight of those unborn generations which, because of our unreadiness to take corrective action in controlling population growth, will be denied any expectations beyond abject poverty and suffering, then history will rightly condemn us.

Those of us who seek to discuss the population problem today owe an incalculable debt to the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Pennsylvania for creating an atmosphere of knowledge and understanding. In this atmosphere we may profitably examine the population explosion, the dangers which it poses to mankind, the steps which are being taken, and which need to be taken, to cope with it.

II

Many startling facts about the growth of the world's population are well known. It took all of human history to the beginning of this century for the world's population to reach one and one-half billion. In just 65 years—since the turn of the century—the population has more than doubled. In the next 35 years, if present

trends continue, the population will more than double again. It would reach over seven billion.

The present growth rate in world population is 2 percent a year. That may not sound like much; but the Population Council estimates that if the human race had begun with a single couple at the time of Jesus and had grown steadily at 2 percent a year since then, there would now be 20 million times as many people as there are now, or 100 people per square foot of the earth's surface.

This growth rate is not uniform throughout the world. Unfortunately, it is far greater in the less developed countries. The Population Council reports that the third of the world's population that lives in the developed countries—Europe, North America, the U.S.S.R., Australia, New Zealand, Japan—has a growth rate of 1.2 percent. The other two-thirds—the peoples of Africa, Latin America, and most of Asia—have a growth rate of 2.5 percent. This means that the population of these areas will double within the next 30 years or less. The Population Reference Bureau has recently made a detailed study of population growth rates throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have this study printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the grim predictions of Thomas Malthus are already coming true in the less developed nations; men die of starvation because the ability to create life has outrun the ability to sustain it.

III

Let us turn our thoughts to our own Nation. We cannot effectively help those abroad who would meet the menace of overpopulation if we are not willing to face up to our own situation. We cannot have a double standard.

Because most of us are more concerned about consuming too many calories, rather than too few, we instinctively feel that the population problem is something which only famine-ridden countries need to worry about. We complacently think that "It can't happen here." Yet our population grows with startling rapidity. It increased from 76 million in 1900 to about 181 million in 1960. By 1970, there will be almost 210 million people in the United States and by the end of the century, there are almost certain to be more than 300 million, or four times as many as at the turn of the century. That would mean the population had tripled since 1920—all since the end of the era of mass migration to the United States.

Fortunately, it appears likely, at least for the immediate future, that the increases in our gross national product will continue to outrun our population increases. Although the pressures upon our scarce land and water resources will become more intense, I do not doubt that we shall be able to feed, clothe, house and educate our swelling citizenry at or above our present standards. But even if we can physically provide for a grow-

ing number of people, there are disturbing social, psychological and moral problems to consider.

I do not suggest that the Government of the United States should advocate family planning. This is a private matter on which Government should not take any position. But it would be an equally shameful perversion of duty if officials charged with the public welfare did not freely and frankly face social realities.

The realities are that 4 out of every 5 American couples have the education, the knowledge, and the financial means to make a meaningful and informed private decision on whether and how to limit their families. Four of five American couples have reasonable access to a doctor who can provide such medical advice and assistance as they might desire.

But the remaining 20 percent of American families lack the effective freedom to make private decisions in this area. These are indigent families who desire to limit the number of children but who are unable to afford or obtain proper medical assistance. As a result these families all too often bring children into the world whom they cannot support and whom they did not want. A recent survey conducted in the South showed that 3 out of every 4 Negro women did not want any more children, but that over half did not know how to stop having them because they did not have access to good medical advice or assistance.

Seventeen percent of low-income white families interviewed in 1960 reported that, before the last conception occurred, either the wife or the husband or both had not really wanted another child at any time in the future. Among families in which the wife's education was grade school or less, 32 percent of white couples and 43 percent of nonwhite couples had unwanted children.

The experience with family planning services in my own city of Baltimore provides dramatic proof that there is a demand for such services. In February 1965, the Baltimore City Health Department began making information and medical advice available on a broad scale to indigent women who so requested. In a single year, over 4,000 Baltimore mothers have requested family planning services. This represents an increase of 100 percent in the number of indigent women in Baltimore City who are receiving family planning assistance through public or nonprofit private organizations. It shows that private organizations—and Baltimore has one of the most active planned parenthood groups in the country—cannot meet the need alone.

For the poor family, an unwanted child increases the burden of poverty. For the child, it all too often means growing up in an atmosphere that is hostile or indifferent. When a child grows up in a household where he is not wanted, where his father is absent or unconcerned, where there is no one to give him the love and the discipline which any child requires, are not his chances to develop into a useful, well-adjusted citizen tragically diminished?

Recent studies by the New York City Youth Board have confirmed that the child who is reared in poverty and neglect, may well become a juvenile delinquent.

Neglected youth tend to take out their bitterness against society when they become adults. James V. Bennett, former Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, told Senator GRUENING's subcommittee:

In all my experience of dealing with the disadvantaged and the underprivileged, no case is sadder or more baffling than that of the lonesome, unwanted child * * * I know many who came into the world unwelcomed and undesired, who became burdens on our culture and sought to even their grudge against society with a knife or a gun or retreated into the solace of drugs acquired by assault, burglary, or prostitution.

I believe that a couple should not lose the right to plan the size of their family merely because they are too poor to seek medical assistance or advice. The Government has a responsibility to provide family planning services to those who desire them and cannot otherwise afford them—provided that this is done under programs which make certain that no person is influenced or coerced to limit his family or to use any particular method of family planning.

Regrettably, the Federal Government, held back by lack of funds and lack of authorization from Congress, has done relatively little to help provide family planning services or to stimulate research in the field of fertility control. Recent statistics show that last year the Public Health Service made only \$50,000 in grants to be used for family planning assistance. The National Institutes of Health have a budget of only \$500,000 for research into problems of fertility control. To be sure, President Johnson has proposed a substantial increase in research funds for fiscal 1967, but at best these proposed increases, when appropriated, will only bring the Federal Government roughly on a par with the amount of funds the Ford Foundation now spends on research in this area.

Some preliminary steps were taken toward Federal participation in family planning with the passage of the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Amendments of 1963. Under this legislation, 31 maternity and infant care centers have been set up in the United States and Puerto Rico. All but three of these centers offer family planning services. The Children's Bureau estimates that about \$3 million is now being spent on family planning.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is now granting funds to community action agencies for the purpose of establishing family planning programs—provided that no contraceptive devices or drugs are given to unmarried women or to married women not living with their husbands. So far, about \$1 million in grants have been given out through the war on poverty program.

None of this, however, is nearly enough to close the gap in family planning services needed. Last year, the total amount of money spent on family planning assistance from all sources, public and private, amounted to less

than \$15 million. Most of this was spent by a single private organization, the Planned Parenthood Affiliates. As a result, only about 500,000 indigent couples in the United States could be served.

Studies undertaken by planned parenthood affiliates indicate that there are at any given time in this country, approximately 5 million medically indigent women who potentially desire family planning assistance.

This figure was carefully derived by taking the number of persons in families with incomes below \$3,000 per year, dividing this number in half to obtain the approximate number of medically indigent women, and making necessary adjustments to exclude those who are naturally infertile or not of childbearing age and further to exclude those women in this group who, at any given time, are pregnant or seeking to become pregnant with one of their first three children. The assumption that each woman who has had three children is a potential candidate for family planning assistance, is based on studies showing that three children is the average ideal number desired by American parents of all social classes.

About one-half million indigent women now receive such aid from public or private sources. Many of the remaining 4½ million need and want such assistance. The National Academy of Sciences estimates that 45 percent of the women in poor families with more than three children did not want their last pregnancy. In view of this we are safe in assuming that at least several million indigent couples want family planning services.

Planned parenthood's average cost of providing family planning assistance is \$20 per patient per year. With a potential clientele of 5 million women today, experts in this field do not seem rash then in calling for a total public and private investment of \$100 million by 1970, of which three-quarters or \$75 million would have to be provided from Government funds and the rest provided by public or private organizations. My bill would provide these funds by authorizing \$15 million the first year and an additional \$15 million for each of 4 subsequent years. This would be enough with a matching contribution, to serve a million women the first year, 2 million the second, and so on, until the entire 5 million receive assistance by 1970.

Compare this, however, to the cost of maintaining the unfortunate, unwanted child who has become a burden to society. We spend billions to support those who cannot support themselves; many of these people were born to poor parents who did not want them and could not provide for them.

The legislation which I propose will work through existing machinery—local and State health departments and private, nonprofit organizations. To the maximum extent possible, each recipient will be encouraged to set eligibility requirements and program standards which reflect its own needs and do not offend the feelings of those it seeks to serve.

Obviously many different approaches to family planning are going to evolve;

and that is all to the good. Sensitive moral and philosophical questions should be resolved on the local level, and not in Washington.

Attempts by the Office of Economic Opportunity to impose Federal eligibility requirements for family planning programs demonstrate the difficulties in a centralized bureaucratic approach from Washington. Earlier this month the trustees of Washington's antipoverty program rejected a \$79,000 family planning grant because the OEO demanded that the money be spent only to aid married couples living together. My bill does not prohibit or require recipients to provide family planning assistance to unmarried women. I think that in these matters we have got to allow local communities to make up their own minds on the way they wish to operate.

My bill does not set up any super-bureaus to deal with family planning. Existing agencies and bureaus within HEW would administer the law. Grants would be made to private, nonprofit agencies, to State and local health departments, and to hospitals; they will do the job. Mr. George Lindsay, the chairman of Planned Parenthood-World Population, has recently pointed out that since 97 percent of the Nation's women deliver their babies in hospitals, an increase in hospital family planning services is one of the most important single steps in setting up an effective program.

I realize that many sincere and high-minded Americans, predominantly but not exclusively of the Catholic faith, have argued that the Government has no right to intrude in a field which involves moral decisions. They say that the Government must remain strictly neutral, and neutrality for them means no Government action at all.

Now I certainly agree that the Government must not take a position for or against family planning. No one proposes, and my bill specifically forbids, the establishment of a corps of social workers to serve as advocates of family limitation or of any particular method of family planning. But I deny that neutrality implies inaction.

By not taking action the Government removes the power of private moral decision from the hands of poor couples. By failing to provide wanted assistance, the Government implicitly says that family planning is immoral and information concerning it should be kept from as many people as possible.

In effect it says to the indigent couple: "Because you are poor and cannot afford private medical assistance, you have no right to practice family planning, however much you may desire." This attitude sets up a vicious double standard—the rich are allowed to practice family planning because they do not need public assistance. They have the means to consult with a family physician. But the poor, the unfortunate, the needy—those who need the help of qualified public health personnel—are denied the right to make responsible family decisions.

I do not think the Government is being neutral when its inaction makes wealth the basis for determining man's rights,

and his responsibility as a parent, and his ability to make a decision reflecting the future of his own family.

Leading members of the Catholic Church do not object on principle to voluntary family planning programs that respect freedom of conscience. Cardinal Cushing has said:

[It] is important to note that Catholics do not need the support of civil law to be faithful to their own religious convictions and they do not seek to impose by law their moral views on other members of society. (Boston Pilot, Mar. 6, 1965.)

IV

I have already given the cold, impersonal figures which tell of the staggering population growth in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. But it is scarcely possible for us to calculate the human costs, to imagine the terrible burdens which this soaring population imposes on nations which are struggling to remove the shackles of centuries of disease, ignorance, and deprivation.

For these people, in many instances, the gift of life often becomes a curse, dooming a new-born child to an existence in which mere sustenance is hopelessly lacking, in which social betterment is a hollow dream. For them the specter of starvation haunts their crudely cultivated fields by day and their wretched village huts by night.

Gen. William Draper, the new head of the Population Crisis Committee, has bluntly warned that the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America "are on a collision course with their food supply." He said:

The stark fact is, if the population continues to increase faster than food production, hundreds of millions will actually starve in the next decade. The 2 billions of people living in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are increasing by more than 2 percent a year and their food resources by only 1 percent a year. They are losing the race between food and people.

Experts in the Department of Agriculture have estimated that, merely to maintain present meager diets in Asia, yields per acre must increase by more than 50 percent between now and 1980. It would require 24 million tons of fertilizer to obtain such yields and, at present, there are only 28.6 million tons being produced in the entire world.

Recently I visited India, the country where the population crisis is the most severe, where hunger riots have broken out periodically in the past 5 years. I came away convinced that programs of family planning are the only alternative to unparalleled human suffering. U.S. imports of grain cannot continue to meet the burgeoning demands. Even last year, when India had a record crop, she was forced to import one-fifth of the U.S. total wheat output to meet her food needs.

Today we in the United States have barely enough surplus wheat in this country to satisfy our own needs for more than 6 months should a major catastrophe blight our crop.

I heartily endorse the President's recommendation that we increase domestic agricultural output and use the resulting surpluses in our food-for-peace program. Similar suggestions have been

put forward most eloquently by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE]. But we all know that America cannot hope to feed the almost 4 billion people who would swell the world's population by the end of the century if present trends continue. And even if we could, it would hardly be advisable to make large areas of the world totally dependent on the United States for the margin between minimal sustenance and starvation. This would sap their self-reliance and destroy their national dignity.

Some people have said optimistically that if the United States can send a man to the moon, we can surely teach Asian farmers to grow more grain. But the truth is that it is more difficult to break through barriers of illiteracy and entrenched tradition than it is to thrust out of the barriers of space. Having been to India, and having been deeply impressed by the dedication of their leaders, I would be the last person to downgrade the dedication of its Government and its people. Yet, one must conclude that India and much of the underdeveloped world will never be able to feed their people unless they find ways to control the population explosion. Fortunately, I believe India and other nations are beginning to realize this.

Many foreign governments have undertaken programs of family planning within the past few years. Korea, the Republic of China, and Tunisia are on the way to establishing effective national programs. India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic, and Turkey are also making efforts to set up programs which will reach all of their people. Until very recently, no government in Latin America, with the exception of Chile, had undertaken any programs in this field. But now Peru, Venezuela, Honduras, and Colombia have established population units as a part of their public health ministries.

These government family planning programs are a normal political response to the desire of millions of people in these countries to gain the knowledge which will allow them to plan the size of their families in accordance with their means and their personal aspirations. Dr. Irene B. Taeuber, of the Office of Population Research at Princeton University, told Senator GRUENING's subcommittee that:

Studies in country after country, among remote villagers and city dwellers, among peoples of diverse cultures and many faiths, among the illiterate and the schooled * * * indicate that families wish children, but only those for whom they can provide adequate living, school, and an economic future.

Recent studies in India show that 62 to 77 percent of Indian mothers have expressed a desire to limit the size of their families.

Against this background of growing concern and activity, the U.S. Government has taken its first really positive steps to help those countries which are seeking to control their population growth. In March of 1965, AID Administrator David Bell advised all AID missions that AID would entertain requests from foreign governments for direct as-

sistance in setting up family planning programs.

Since that time, AID has offered technical advice, assistance, or local currency to six different countries. Missions have been sent to India, Pakistan, Turkey, and the United Arab Republic to advise the officials in those countries who are setting up family planning programs. Turkey has requested and appears likely to receive over \$3 million worth of jeeps for use in transporting workers and educational equipment to remote parts of the country. U.S.-owned local currencies have been released in Korea and Taiwan to help finance family planning projects which the Population Council, a private agency, established.

The Alliance for Progress has helped to finance a number of population studies and personnel training programs in Latin America. This agency recently made a grant of \$176,000 to the University of Notre Dame to initiate a 3-year project which will study the whole area of family sociology. The project will be done in cooperation with educational institutions in Latin America. They have also aided the University of Puerto Rico in conducting programs to train family planning personnel.

This is a useful beginning. But it is only a beginning. In the 11 months since AID announced its new policies, the world's population has grown by 60 million. If we are to make a significant impact on the population growth rates in this century, it is incumbent upon us to treat every year, every month, and every day as an irreplaceable opportunity for action. I am hopeful, therefore, that AID will accelerate its programs and intensify its concern and that its steps will be less hesitant.

The first and most pressing need is to train more public health personnel to advise those countries which seek our help in setting up national family planning programs. At present, we have the greatest pool of available experts in this field—administrators, doctors, and demographers—but present demands have already exceeded the available supply. We need to institute Government programs to train more personnel in the field of family planning. The President's International Health Act, if creatively administered, can go far toward accomplishing this goal.

We also need to institute programs to help foreign nations send their own personnel for training to our schools of public health and demographic centers. We also need to help them to establish and expand programs for training in family planning at their own public health and medical schools.

If we are effectively to help those nations which seek to control their population explosion, we must also realize that this problem cannot be solved in a few years—by a brief frenzied infusion of American experts. To establish sound and humane family planning programs, nations must improve their entire range of public health programs. Under present conditions it is medically dangerous to administer modern birth control devices where there are not doctors

or hospitals to treat women in case of complications.

Equally important, Dr. Carl E. Taylor, the distinguished director of the division of international health at the Johns Hopkins University, has offered impressive evidence to show that family planning is accepted most readily where health and medical services have been established longest. Surveys conducted in 20 different parts of India showed that parents wanted only 3 or 4 children but found it necessary to have 8 or 10 because they knew from experience that half of their children would die. Attempts during the 1950's to institute family planning programs in parts of India where medical facilities were undeveloped proved far less successful than in areas where medical facilities had been established.

A preliminary generalization, based on field trials in rural Japan, India, and Ceylon, is that areas with developed medical facilities are making the best progress in establishing successful family planning programs.

To meet the population crisis, then, we must help nations to make a new assault on disease and suffering. We must aid them in building up the entire structure of medical and health facilities, in providing rural health centers, in training doctors and nurses, in improving their medical schools and schools of public health.

When I was in India last summer, I asked the responsible minister how it was intended to have family planning implemented in the field. I was advised that in many instances malaria eradication clinics were being used. Those clinics had been established previously and had done magnificent work in the control of malaria in India.

Those who have pioneered in the field of family planning are unanimous in their belief that except for administrative consultants and teaching doctors, the overwhelming majority of family planning personnel must be natives of the countries involved. Foreign women will naturally accept advice and assistance far more readily from those who share their language and culture.

If we are to help in this long-term struggle against overpopulation, we must use every available source of revenues. It seems to me that the excess local currencies which pile up abroad are a logical source from which to draw. Under present law, 20 percent of the foreign currencies which our country accumulates through the sale of food under Public Law 480 and all of the foreign currency which we acquire through the repayment of "soft" loans under the Development Loan Fund are restricted to so-called U.S. uses funds. That is to say, they may be made available through the appropriations process to pay U.S. obligations, such as embassy expenses, maintenance of military bases, and the like. This is as it should be.

But in many countries the amount of money in our U.S. uses funds far exceeds the expenses which we incur, or are likely to incur. In India, for example, there is over \$500 million worth of rupees in our U.S. uses funds. This is far more

than we can use; but in order to free these funds for other uses we must, under existing law, go through the complete appropriation process. In short, we must treat existing foreign currency reserves as though they were new dollars.

Holdings of foreign currencies in U.S. uses accounts are also in excess of foreseeable U.S. requirements in Burma, Pakistan, Guinea, and the United Arab Republic. They are near excess in 11 other countries, including Brazil, Colombia, Indonesia, Syria, Turkey, and Tunisia.

The White House Conference on International Cooperation has estimated that America will need to spend \$100 million a year for the next 3 years in order to provide effective help to those nations which seek to set up national family planning programs. My bill would simply unfreeze 5 percent of these excess U.S. uses funds and allow them to be used by foreign governments and private nonprofit U.S. organizations—such as the Ford Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation which have done such magnificent work in this field—to establish voluntary family planning programs in friendly foreign countries that request such assistance. Since these funds are already excess to any foreseeable U.S. use, the effective cost to the United States is virtually nil. It makes better financial sense to invest some of these funds in urgently needed family planning projects than to allow them to lie around and depreciate. But with more than \$1½ billion worth of foreign currencies already excess to our needs, just 5 percent or \$65 million in local currencies, would make a great impact upon population problems in these countries.

My proposed amendment to S. 2933, the food for freedom bill, follows the approach suggested by Representative PAUL TORD, Democrat, of Michigan, and the amendment introduced last Friday by the very able Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. Although the language differs, the basic idea is identical: specifically to authorize the use of soft currencies which hereafter accumulate under our sales of surplus agricultural commodities to finance voluntary family planning programs in friendly nations that desire such assistance.

v

There can never be a truly peaceful world while men die of starvation and live in squalor. The people of the emerging nations know that these conditions need not be the inevitable lot of man. They look hopefully toward a future in which opportunity is greater. If these hopes are thwarted because the burgeoning population nullifies man's efforts to create a richer life then I say that no disarmament agreement, no U.N. peace force will keep our planet from being torn with strife and violence.

We simply must help those nations which commit themselves to combat the menace of overpopulation. To do less is inhumane—and contrary to the national interest of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills and amendment will be received and appropriately referred; and, without ob-

jection, the bills and amendment will be printed in the RECORD, and the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The bills, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"S. 2992

"A bill to authorize the use of foreign currencies to finance family planning programs in friendly foreign nations, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 612 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. Sec. 2362), is amended by adding a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) In addition to funds otherwise available, and notwithstanding Section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1953, excess foreign currencies, as defined in subsection (b), may be made available to friendly foreign governments and to private, nonprofit United States organizations to carry out voluntary family planning programs in countries which request such assistance. No such program shall be assisted unless the President has received assurances that in the administration of such program, the recipient will take reasonable precautions to insure that no person receives any family planning assistance or supplies unless he desires such services. The excess foreign currencies made available under this subsection shall not, in any one year, exceed 5 percent of the aggregate of all excess foreign currencies.

"As used in this subsection the term 'voluntary planning program' includes, but is not limited to, demographic studies, medical and psychological research, personnel training, the construction and staffing of clinics and rural health centers, specialized training of doctors and paramedical personnel, the manufacture of medical supplies, and the dissemination of family planning information, medical assistance and supplies to individuals who desire such assistance."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"S. 2993

"A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and to private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"SECTION 1. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make grants to State, local or other public agencies, and to private, nonprofit organizations for the purpose of assisting them in carrying on necessary programs in the field of voluntary family planning. Such programs may include demographic studies, medical and psychological research, the training of personnel, and the dissemination of family planning information, medical supervision and supplies to individuals who desire such information, assistance or supplies.

"SEC. 2. (a) Grants under this Act shall be made only under regulations promulgated by the Secretary. No grant shall be approved unless it contains and is supported by reasonable assurances that in carrying out any program assisted by any such grant, the applicant will establish and follow procedures designed to insure that—

"(1) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical or religious beliefs; and

"(2) no individual will be provided any medical supervision or supplies unless such individual has voluntarily filed a written request with the applicant asking for such medical supervision or supplies.

"(b) The use of family planning services provided by the applicant under such grant shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs of financial or medical assistance.

"(c) The Secretary shall make grants to carry out programs for the dissemination of family planning information, medical supervision and supplies only to applicants who—

"(1) serve areas where there are substantial concentrations of low-income families; or

"(2) will otherwise utilize such grants primarily to serve low-income families.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary shall not deny a grant under this Act to any applicant which is otherwise eligible therefor on the grounds that—

"(a) Such applicant will provide family planning assistance which is limited in scope to one or more methods or aspects of family planning;

"(b) The area to be served by the programs to be carried on by such applicant is already served by other family planning programs;

"(c) The applicant, under standards it prescribes, provides assistance to unmarried individuals.

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act the term 'nonprofit,' when applied to any agency or organization, means a private agency or organization no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private owner or shareholder thereof, or any other private person.

"SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall authorize the Secretary to establish any new bureau or agency through which to exercise his authority under this Act. The Secretary shall, to the extent possible, utilize existing bureaus and agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the personnel thereof to carry out his responsibilities under this Act.

"SEC. 6. (a) No grant under this Act shall exceed 75 percentum of the total of the expenses required to carry on the program with respect to which the grant is made.

"(b) for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than \$15,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; \$30,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; \$45,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; \$60,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; and \$75,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

The amendment (No. 489) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

AMENDMENT 489

Intended to be proposed by Mr. TYDINGS to S. 2933, a bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes:

On page 13, line 2, strike the colon following the word "currencies," insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and add the following new subsection:

"(i) To assist friendly foreign governments and private, nonprofit United States organizations to carry out voluntary family planning programs in countries which request such assistance. No such program shall be assisted unless the President has received assurances that in the administration of such program, the recipient will take reasonable precautions to insure that no person receives any family planning assistance or supplies unless he desires such services.

As used in this subsection, the term 'voluntary family planning program' includes, but is not limited to, demographic studies, medical and psychological research, personnel training, the construction and staffing of clinics and rural health centers, specialized training of doctors and paramedical personnel, the manufacture of medical supplies, and the dissemination of family planning information, medical supervision, and supplies to individuals who desire such assistance."

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1966]
POLL FINDS CATHOLICS BACK BIRTH CURB AID
 (By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—Most Americans, including Catholics, favor Federal aid to States, cities, and foreign governments for birth control programs, according to a recent poll.

The survey also shows that most Catholics in the United States believe that the Roman Catholic Church should modify its opposition to many forms of birth control.

They also believe that birth control information should be easily available to any married person who wants it, the poll found.

The survey into American attitudes on population policy was conducted last fall by the Gallup Organization, Inc., headed by George Gallup. It was taken for the Population Council, a nonprofit foundation that has been active in promoting population control programs at home and abroad.

The results of the survey, which is believed by population planners to be the most definitive yet conducted on the politically touchy subject of birth control, will be published soon.

The survey was based on a scientific sampling of 3,205 persons. By public opinion survey standards, this was a large cross section. The Government's monthly unemployment report, for example, is based on a sampling of 3,500 persons.

The number of Catholics polled in the Gallup survey was not given, but in a probability sample such as is used in public opinion surveys, steps are taken to be sure of an adequate cross section of all groups.

The poll may have a considerable political impact; the administration is running into its first political difficulties in its quiet but deliberate move of the last year to extend Federal assistance to birth control programs at home and abroad.

Under a policy laid down by President Johnson a year ago, the Agency for International Development has begun extending assistance to foreign governments for direct support of birth control programs.

This policy has recently been challenged by Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, who represents a district with a large Catholic vote in Milwaukee County.

In letters to AID, Mr. ZABLOCKI has asked whether the Agency, in its new policy, was not violating congressional intent. He argued that Congress meant to limit Government assistance to demographic and sociological studies rather than authorize outright support of birth control programs.

In view of Mr. ZABLOCKI's influential position as ranking Democrat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, his letters have caused considerable concern among aid officials, who were already hesitant about pushing too fast into the politically sensitive area of birth control.

SUPPORT INDICATED

But the main finding to emerge from the poll was that the voters would strongly support any move by the administration to assist State or local governments or foreign countries in birth control programs.

In response to the question "Do you feel that the U.S. Government should give aid to States and cities for birth control programs

if they request it?" 63 percent responded "yes," 28 percent "no" and 9 percent "don't know."

To the question "Do you think our Government should help other countries with their birth control programs if they ask us?" 58 percent said "yes," 34 percent "no" and 8 percent "don't know."

Of the 58 percent supporting foreign assistance, 62 percent—or a minority of the total sample—favored going beyond administration policy by furnishing birth control supplies. The present policy is limited to technical and financial assistance for family planning programs.

The church now opposes all chemical or mechanical methods of contraception but does condone the rhythm method in which intercourse is limited to the nonfertile periods of a woman's monthly cycle.

Among the Catholics polled, 56 percent favored a change in the church's policy, compared with 53 percent among non-Catholics, and 33 percent were opposed, compared with 22 percent among non-Catholics. The Catholic support for a change in policy was particularly strong among the younger generation; among those Catholics 60 or older, only 39 percent favored a shift in the church's position.

The poll showed that Catholics as well as non-Catholics were overwhelmingly in support of providing birth control information to married couples.

In response to the question "Do you believe that information about birth control, ought to be easily available to any married person who wants it?", 86 percent of the non-Catholics and 81 percent of the Catholics replied "yes."

But a difference developed on the question whether such information should be easily available to any single adult person who wants it. A slight majority of non-Catholics—52 percent—favored such a policy, but it was supported by only 43 percent of the Catholics.

By coincidence, the survey was conducted in two periods immediately before and after Pope Paul VI's visit to the United States last October. In his speech before the United Nations, the Pope appeared to reaffirm the church's position on birth control.

AMERICAN ATTITUDES ON POPULATION POLICY

In fall 1965 the Population Council sponsored a survey of American attitudes on population policy. The survey was conducted by the Gallup Organization, Inc., and consisted of two interview waves with identical questions. The respondents were selected as a modified probability sample, with 1,571 cases in the first wave (in the field September 15-22) and 1,634 cases in the second wave (October 6-14). Unless otherwise indicated below, the two waves are combined in this report, and the results are based on a times-at-home weighting designed to improve sample representation.*

* The times-at-home method for adjusting survey data for persons not at home when the interviewer calls is based on the fact that in any sample using a single call the people reached can be grouped in terms of the extent to which they are usually at home. Some persons tend to be at home most of the time, some part of the time, and some infrequently. If groupings based on how frequently they can be found at home are made, then within each group or stratum we have a sample of persons who are homogeneous in this respect. Also we know that the people infrequently at home are underrepresented and those at home most of the time are overrepresented. This can be corrected if we have some measure of how often they are to be found at home. We can weight by the reciprocal of the fraction of time they are home. The measure adopted for classifying people in these terms is how many days

The questionnaire, made up completely of checklist questions, was initially formulated by John F. Kantner, then on the staff of the Population Council and now chairman of the Department of Sociology at the University of Western Ontario. The following report, prepared by Bernard Berelson of the Council, presents all the questions used in the survey and thus shows the kinds of information that can be secured in this way. The same questions may be asked in a similar survey 1 or 2 years hence in order to develop trend data on these matters.

THE TOTAL SAMPLE

"Can you tell me about how many people there are in the United States?"

	Percent
Under 50 million.....	8
50-99 million.....	6
100-149 million.....	8
150-174 million.....	10
175-199 million.....	22
200-224 million.....	9
225-749 million.....	8
750 million and over.....	8
Can't say.....	21

At the time of the interview, the correct figure was about 193 million, so only about one in five respondents named the right category. If the range is broadened to, say 25 million on either side of the right figure, the proportion correct is only about one-third of the total sample. Furthermore, of those providing a figure, just over half responded only after the probe: "Can you make a rough guess?" In other words, only one in the three gave a number in response to the initial question. Of them, about half gave the right answer, as against only one in seven of those guessing.

"If our population continues its present rate of growth, how many years will it be before it is twice as large as it is now?"

	Percent
10 years or less.....	15
11 to 25 years.....	27
26 to 44 years.....	16
45 to 60 years.....	15
61 to 75 years.....	3
76 to 100 years.....	4
Over 100 years.....	3
Can't say.....	17

In this case, the correct answer at the time was just over 50 years, the category for which only a few people were able to give. Here too, slightly over half the respondents were guessing, this time after two probes. Of those not guessing, only 13 percent gave the right answer. In short, people simply do not know the answer to this question and when they guess, they make the growth far faster than in fact it is.

"Here are some countries that have different rates of population growth. After each one, tell me whether you think it is growing faster, slower, or about the same as the United States?"

[In percent]

	Faster	Slower	About same	Don't know
Brazil.....	30	23	18	29
England.....	9	41	29	21
India.....	66	8	7	19
Japan.....	57	10	15	18
U.S.S.R.....	30	16	30	24

they have been at home in a given number of days previous to the day the interview takes place, and at the same time of day. In the case of this survey the question was asked concerning 3 previous days. This combined with the day of interview provides information on 4 days. Weighting on the basis of this information is theoretically equivalent to four calls with regard to having a sample equivalently weighted by times-at-home groupings.

Here again, nearly half of those giving an answer were guessing, after a probe, and nearly one-fourth were not even willing to guess. In general, people are right on India and England, wrong on Japan, and doubtful on the others, but only a few know this comparative picture.

"What about the rate at which the U.S. population is growing? Do you feel this is a serious problem or not?"

"Do you consider the rate of growth of world population as a serious problem or not?"

[In percent]		
	United States	World
Yes.....	54	62
No.....	39	28
Don't know.....	7	10

So the "population problem" is appreciated by a majority of Americans, but about a third of the people have yet to be persuaded. More people believe that population is a serious problem abroad—but not a great deal more. Note here and following that the "don't know" percentage on attitudinal questions is far below the "don't know" figure for the preceding informational queries. As with other such matters on the American scene, general conviction outruns specific information.

(If yes) "Which do you think is the more serious problem—population growth or — in the United States?"

[In percent]				
	Population growth	The other	Both same	Don't know
Crime.....	20	67	11	2
Racial discrimination.....	28	56	11	5
Poverty.....	32	42	21	5

Read: 20 percent think population growth is more serious than crime, 67 percent think crime is more serious than population growth, 11 percent think they are equally serious, and 2 percent don't know. So population growth is well behind crime and race problems, and nearly even with poverty (with which it is probably seen as intertwined).

(If yes) "Which do you think is the more serious problem—the growth of world population or —?"

[In percent]				
	World population growth	The other	Both same	Don't know
International communism.....	19	71	6	4
Threat of nuclear war.....	20	62	7	2
Aid to backward nations.....	45	33	10	12

Read: 19 percent think that world population growth is more serious than international communism, 71 percent think international communism is more serious than population growth, 6 percent think they are equally serious, and 4 percent don't know. Here again, the world's population problem is seen as far behind communism and war, but somewhat ahead of social and economic aid. Even so, note that nearly one in three puts the population problem ahead of the threat of nuclear war.

"Do you believe that information about birth control ought to be easily available to any married person who wants it?"

"To any single adult person who wants it?"

[In percent]			
	Yes	No	Don't know
Married.....	84	10	6
Single.....	50	43	7

There are three main points: (1) overwhelming support for providing birth control information to married people, (2) nearly an even split on providing it to single persons, and (3) very few don't-knows.

"Do you feel that the U.S. Government should give aid to States and cities for birth control programs if they request it?"

"Do you think our Government should help other countries with their birth control programs if they ask us?" (If yes) "Would this include furnishing birth control supplies?"

[In percent]			
	Yes	No	Don't know
Aid to States and cities.....	63	28	9
Aid to other countries.....	58	34	8
(If yes) supplies.....	62	31	7

Note that (1) a firm majority favors the provision of such aid—nearly two-to-one on both questions combined; (2) there is not much difference between aid at home and abroad, but the edge goes to domestic help; and (3) of those approving foreign aid, a good majority also approve the furnishing of birth control supplies—though that is a minority of the total sample. (Present AID policy allows the provision of technical assistance on family planning but not supplies.)

"The Roman Catholic Church does not approve many methods of birth control. Do you believe that the church should change its position on this matter?"

Percent	
Yes.....	54
No.....	24
Don't know.....	22

A clear majority is favorable—over two-to-one of those giving their position. The high "don't know" for an attitudinal question is accounted for mainly by non-Catholics (Catholics 11 percent don't know, non-Catholics 25 percent) probably attributable to lack of information as well as the outsider's reluctance to judge another's policy, and consequently his deference thereto.

SOCIAL DIFFERENTIALS

The social differentials that matter are few—mainly sex, education, and religion.

On the informational questions, the educated do much better, and men do a little better. For example, here are the percentages who are correct about the size of the U.S. population:

Percent	
Grade school.....	13
High school.....	21
More than high school.....	36
Women.....	13
Men.....	32

The educated also do considerably better on the country comparisons, but not the men.

On the attitudinal side, here are the major differences:

By sex: Among those who consider population to be a serious problem (roughly equal between men and women), men are somewhat more likely to stress population in comparison with the other problems. The only other difference by sex comes on the provision of contraceptive information to single persons: 57 percent yes from men, 42 percent yes from women.

Education matters on most questions:

[In percent]			
	Yes to U.S. problem serious	Yes to world problem serious	Give information to married
Grade school.....	51	54	75
High school.....	54	62	88
More than high school.....	58	76	92

[In percent]				
	Give information to single	Federal aid to States and cities	Federal aid to other countries	Roman Catholic Church should change
Grade school.....	39	58	45	40
High school.....	51	63	59	56
More than high school.....	63	66	74	68

Note that the slightest differences appear on the two questions in which the uneducated (i.e., the poor) have a personal stake—the U.S. problem and Federal aid to the States and cities.

And here are the major attitudinal differences by religion:

[In percent]			
	Yes to U.S. problem serious	Yes to world problem serious	Give information to married
Catholics.....	44	60	81
Non-Catholics.....	57	64	86

[In percent]			
	Give information to single	Federal aid to States and cities	Federal aid to other countries
Catholics.....	43	59	55
Non-Catholics.....	52	65	59

On every question, the Catholics are less persuaded—but for the most part only slightly so. Incidentally, this is not simply a reflection of the Catholics' lower education: on every educational level, the Catholics show such differences relative to the non-Catholics.

Finally, here is the response to the question about Catholic policy:

[In percent]		
	Catholics	Non-Catholics
Church should change.....	56	53
Church should not change.....	33	22
Don't know.....	11	25

The Catholics themselves strongly favor a change, and they are far less undecided. Actually, Catholic opinion on this matter is quite homogeneous except for the elderly. Among Catholics from their 20's through the 50's, the percentage favoring a change varies only between 58 and 62 percent, but of those age 60 and over, only 39 percent are for a shift in the Catholic position.

By a chance in timing, the two waves of interviews were held around the Pope's appearance at the United Nations on October 4, on which occasion he observed that "your task is to insure that there is enough bread on the tables of mankind, and not to encourage artificial birth control, which would be irrational, in order to diminish the number of guests at the banquet of life." Did

that statement have an important impact on the attitudes of American Catholics? The evidence is not conclusive, partly because of sample size, but there is perhaps a suggestion that the Pope did influence some Catholic opinion, at any rate directly after the event. More Catholics, and non-Catholics too, appeared to believe that the population problems were serious in the second wave but fewer favored the indicated policies—only by 5 percentage points or less in most cases. However, on two central questions—whether the church should change its position and whether the Federal Government should help other countries with birth control programs—Catholic attitudes seemed to move somewhat more than non-Catholic from before to after the Pope's statement:

	[In percent]			
	Catholics		Non-Catholics	
	Before	After	Before	After
Church should change.....	58	55	55	52
Church should not change.....	29	36	20	23
Don't know.....	13	9	25	25
Government should aid other countries.....	60	51	62	56
Government should not aid other countries.....	31	41	31	35
Don't know.....	9	8	7	9
Total number of cases.....	407	374	1,127	1,238

Both Catholics and non-Catholics were less favorable after than before but the Catholics' position moved somewhat further—though on balance it is still on the favorable side. These differences generally fall within normal errors for samples of this size so no firm answer can be given, but the data do suggest that the Pope's statement had some effect on these questions.

It must, of course, be borne in mind that this measurement was taken immediately after the event and does not indicate what lasting impact the occasion may have made upon American opinion with regard to population policy.

EXHIBIT II

Population information for 131 countries—World population data sheet

Continent and country	Population estimates mid-1965 (millions)	Annual rate of increase from 1958-63 (percent)	Number of years to double population ¹	Birth rate per 1,000 population	Death rate per 1,000 population	Infant mortality rate (deaths under 1 year per 1,000 live births)	Per capita gross national product, 1963 ² (in U.S. dollars)
World.....	3,308	2.0	35	36	16		
Africa.....		2.3	31	46	23		135
Northern and eastern Africa.....		2.5	28				
Algeria.....	12.6	2.2	32	45-49			185
Burundi.....	2.9	4.3	17				40
Ethiopia.....	22.6						48
Kenya.....	9.4	2.9	24	48-55			89
Libya.....	1.6	3.7	19				359
Madagascar.....	6.4	3.0	24	42-50	17-21		
Malawi.....	4.0	3.9	18				35
Mauritius ⁴7	3.1	23	38.1	8.6	56.7	
Morocco.....	13.3	2.9	24	43-50			173
Mozambique ⁴	7.0	1.7	41				
Rhodesia.....	4.3	3.3	21	46-52			219
Rwanda.....	3.1	2.6	27				40
Somalia.....	2.4						45
Sudan.....	13.5	2.8	25	50-56			100
Tanzania.....	10.6	1.9	37				70
Tunisia.....	4.7	2.1	33	44-47			185
Uganda.....	7.6	2.5	28	42-48			74
United Arab Republic (Egypt).....	29.6	2.5	28	41-44	17-29		139
Zambia.....	3.7	2.8	25	49-54			153
Western, middle, and southern Africa.....		2.4	29				
Angola ⁴	5.2	2.0	35				
Cameroon.....	5.2	1.9	37	37-44	24-30		92
Central African Republic.....	1.4	2.3	31	40-48	26-32		90
Chad.....	3.4			45-52	25-31		55
Congo (Brazzaville).....	.8	1.5	47	43-51			150
Congo (Léopoldville) ⁴	15.6	2.2	32	41-46			80
Dahomey.....	2.4	2.2	32	47-55	20-26		70
Gabbon.....	.5	1.8	39	32-40			200
Gambia ⁴3	2.5	28				
Ghana.....	7.9	3.5	20	48-56	33-35	215-225	226
Guinea.....	3.5	3.0	24	53-57			60
Ivory Coast.....	3.8	3.5	20	49-56			196
Liberia.....	1.1	1.4	50				170
Mali.....	4.6	3.5	20	55-63	26-32		65
Mauritania.....	.9						135
Niger.....	3.4	3.2	22	49-57	24-30		75
Nigeria.....	57.2	1.4	50	46-53			93
Senegal.....	3.5	2.3	31	40-47	23-29		200
Sierra Leone.....	2.2						100
South Africa.....	17.9	2.4	29				492
Togo.....	1.6	2.4	29	50-59	26-32		75
Upper Volta.....	4.8	2.1	33	46-52	27-32	167-182	45
Asia.....		1.8	39	38	20		
Southwest Asia.....		2.4	29	42	18		222
Cyprus.....	0.6	1.1	63	24-27		28-31	620
Iraq.....	7.8	2.8	25	47-51			228
Israel.....	2.6	3.5	20	25.7	6.3	28.2	1,111
Jordan.....	2.0	2.9	24	44-47			199
Kuwait.....	0.5	10.7	7	38-43			3,300
Lebanon.....	2.3	3.0	24				383
Saudi Arabia.....	6.8						175
Syria.....	5.6						148
Turkey.....	31.6	2.9	24	43-48		160-170	233
Yemen.....	5.0						90

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT II—Continued

Population information for 131 countries—World population data sheet—Continued

Continent and country	Population estimates mid-1965 (millions)	Annual rate of increase from 1958-63 (percent)	Number of years to double population ¹	Birth rate per 1,000 population	Death rate per 1,000 population	Infant mortality rate (deaths under 1 year per 1,000 live births)	Per capita gross national product, 1963 ² (in U.S. dollars)
Asia—Continued							
Middle south Asia		³ 2.1	³ 33		³ 21		³ 85
Afghanistan	15.6			45-53			80
Bhutan	0.8						
Ceylon	11.2	2.5	28	35-41	8.7	53-64	142
India	482.5	2.3	31	40-43	21-23	139-146	86
Iran	23.4	2.4	29	42-48	23-27		216
Nepal	10.1	1.6	44	45-53			59
Pakistan	115.0	2.8	25	48-53			81
Southeast Asia		³ 2.4	³ 29		³ 18		³ 113
Burma	24.7	2.1	33	43-50			72
Cambodia	6.4			47-53			127
Indonesia	104.6	2.3	31	43-48	19-23	120-155	80
Laos	2.0	2.4	29				87
Malaysia ⁴	9.4	3.2	22	39-44	8.9	56-65	³ 295
Philippines	32.3	3.2	22	44-50			142
Singapore ⁵	1.9	3.2	22	33.2	5.8	29.3	³ 295
Thailand	30.6	3.0	24	42-48	19-21		106
Vietnam, North	18.5	3.4	21				
Vietnam, South	16.2	3.4	21	41-48			114
East Asia		³ 1.4	³ 50		³ 33		³ 19
China (mainland)	710.0						117
China (Taiwan)	12.4	3.5	20	34.5	5.7	26.4	169
Hong Kong ⁶	3.8	4.7	15	29.4	4.9	26.4	367
Japan	97.8	0.9	78	17.7	6.9	20.4	626
Korea, North	12.0						
Korea, South	28.4	2.8	25	40-45	12-16		114
Mongolia	1.1	3.2	22				
America		³ 2.2	³ 32		³ 32		³ 12
Northern America		³ 1.6	³ 44		³ 22		³ 2,990
Canada	19.6	2.0	35	23.5	7.6	2.47	2,100
United States	194.6	1.6	44	21.2	9.4	24.2	3,083
Middle America		³ 2.8	³ 25				³ 331
Costa Rica	1.4	4.5	16	47-50	8.8	86.4	385
Cuba	7.6	1.8	39	31-36	9-13	77-90	305
Dominican Republic	3.6	3.6	20	48-54	15-20	80-100	269
El Salvador	2.9	3.2	22	46.8	10.4	65.5	275
Guatemala	4.4	3.2	22	47.7	17.2	92.8	284
Haiti	4.7	2.3	31				80
Honduras	2.2	3.2	22	45-50	15-20	47-60	216
Jamaica	1.8	1.8	39	39.9	7.8	39.4	429
Mexico	40.9	3.2	22	45.4	10.3	66.3	402
Nicaragua	1.6	2.9	24	43-52	13-17	75-85	282
Panama	1.2	3.2	22	40.4	9-12	55-65	448
Puerto Rico ⁷	2.6	1.9	37	30.2	7.1	51.3	952
Trinidad and Tobago	1.0	3.2	22	34.5	6.2	39.6	630
South America		³ 2.7	³ 26				³ 310
Argentina	22.4	1.6	44	21.7	8.1	60-65	614
Bolivia	3.7	1.4	50	41-45	20-25	135-165	154
Brazil	81.3	3.1	23	43-47	11-16		196
British Guiana ⁸	.6	2.8	25	42.6	7.9	55.0	260
Chile	8.7	2.3	31	33.7	12.0	111.0	483
Colombia	15.8	2.2	42	42-46	14-17	100-110	292
Ecuador	5.1	3.1	23	45-50	15-20	94-107	199
Paraguay	2.0	2.4	29	45-50	12-16	110-120	193
Peru	11.7	2.8	25	42-48	13-18	95-105	262
Uruguay	2.7	1.2	58	21-25	7-9	75-85	478
Venezuela	8.7	3.4	21	45-50	10-15	60-75	728
Europe		³ 1.9	³ 78		³ 19		³ 10
Northern and Western Europe		³ 1.1	³ 63		³ 18		³ 1,575
Austria	7.3	.6	117	18.6	12.3	29.2	1,069
Belgium	9.4	.5	140	17.2	12.1	27.2	1,496
Denmark	4.8	.7	100	17.6	9.9	18.7	1,675
Finland	4.6	.8	88	17.6	9.3	16.9	1,278
France	48.8	1.3	54	18.1	10.7	23.4	1,658
Germany, West ⁹	56.8	1.3	54	18.5	10.8	26.9	1,635
Iceland	.2	1.9	37	25.1	6.9	17.7	1,719
Ireland	2.8	—	—	22.5	11.4	26.8	797
Luxembourg	.3	1.0	70	16.0	11.8	29.8	1,615
Netherlands	12.3	1.4	50	20.7	7.7	14.8	1,205
Norway	3.7	.8	88	17.9	10.0	16.7	1,537
Sweden	7.7	.5	140	16.0	10.0	14.2	2,046
Switzerland	6.0	2.1	33	19.2	9.4	20.5	2,002
United Kingdom	54.4	.7	100	18.8	11.3	20.6	1,564
Eastern Europe		³ 0.7	³ 100		³ 18		³ 883
Bulgaria	8.2	.9	78	16.1	7.9	32.9	594
Czechoslovakia	14.2	.7	100	17.1	9.6	21.2	1,276
Germany, East	16.0	—	—	17.2	13.5	29.5	363
Hungary	10.1	.4	175	13.1	10.0	39.8	843
Poland	31.6	1.3	54	18.1	7.6	47.7	775
Romania	19.1	.8	88	15.2	8.1	48.6	638

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT II—Continued

Population information for 131 countries—World population data sheet—Continued

Continent and country	Population estimates mid-1965 (millions)	Annual rate of increase from 1957-63 (percent)	Number of years to double population ¹	Birth rate per 1,000 population	Death rate per 1,000 population	Infant mortality rate (deaths under 1 year per 1,000 live births)	Per capita gross national product, 1963 ² (in U.S. dollars)
Eastern Europe—continued							
Southern Europe.....		³ 0.8	³ 88	³ 21	³ 9		
Albania.....	1.9	3.2	22	37.8	8.7	81.5	340
Greece.....	8.6	.7	100	18-20	8-10	35-40	517
Italy.....	52.6	.6	117	20.0	9.6	35.5	894
Malta.....	.3	.4	175	19.8	8.5	34.3	
Portugal.....	9.2	.7	100	23.7	10.2	73.1	321
Spain.....	31.6	.8	88	22.2	8.7	37.9	482
Yugoslavia.....	19.5	1.1	63	20.8	9.4	76.0	
Oceania.....		³ 2.1	³ 33	³ 27	³ 11		³ 1,443
Australia.....	11.4	2.1	33	20.6	9.0	19.1	1,733
New Zealand.....	2.7	2.2	32	14.1	8.8	19.1	1,747
U.S.S.R.....	234.0	1.7	41	19.6	6.9	29.0	1,202

WORLD AND CONTINENTAL POPULATION ESTIMATES (MILLIONS)

	World	Africa	Asia	Northern America	Latin America	Europe	Oceania	U.S.S.R.
Mid-1965.....	3,308	311	1,842	215	248	443	17	234
2,000 projections ¹⁰	7,410	860	4,401	388	756	671	33	402

¹ Assuming continued growth at present rate.² Compiled from Agency for International Development data, using current market prices in 1963 dollars for 1963 population and gross national product figures for non-Communist nations; figures for Communist nations are unofficial estimates.³ Figures for a region of world. The 1964 P.R.B. data sheet gave a mid-1964 world total of 3,283,000,000 projected from the mid-1963 U.N. figure. Final U.N. adjusted estimate for mid-1964 was 3,215,000,000, which at a 2-percent rate yields a 64,000,000 increase.⁴ Nonsovereign country.⁵ Prior to Aug. 1, 1964, known as Republic of the Congo.⁶ Declared independent Feb. 18, 1965.⁷ Singapore, since Sept. 16, 1963, a Constituent State of Malaysia, was declared independent on Aug. 9, 1965.⁸ Figures for Singapore and Malaysia combined.⁹ Excludes West Berlin, population 2,200,000 (1965), except in per capita gross national product which includes West Berlin.¹⁰ Continued-trends projections, U.N. estimates, 1964.

NOTE.—Data are compiled from United Nations and other reliable sources. Leaders indicates lack of reliable information.

Source: Information Service, Population Reference Bureau, December 1965.

EXHIBIT 3

STATEMENT OF DR. ALBERT SZENT-GYORGYI, PHYSICIAN, 1937 NOBEL PRIZE WINNER IN MEDICINE, BEFORE SENATE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES—ON S. 1676, JANUARY 19, 1966

Science has interfered with the order of nature by introducing death control. Women can now give birth to children, bring them up without fear of death, and our own cities are depopulated no more by mysterious epidemics. This means a dangerous disturbance of an age-old balance. If the present population growth continues undisturbed, then, according to Sir Howard Florey, president of the Royal Society and discoverer of penicillin, there will be one square yard available on the earth's surface for every human being in 600 years. If the acceleration of increase goes on, this stage will be reached much sooner, and men will have to kill and eat one another.

This situation could be corrected by interfering once more with nature's order in a way which would compensate for our earlier interference. Now that we have introduced death control, we have to introduce birth control, too.

The problems of birth control are complex, demand study from a social, scientific and technical point of view. They demand action on a scale which far exceeds the ability of the individual, and ask for urgent State action. I have, here, letters from several Nobel Prize winners, who all arrive at a similar conclusion and also point out the narrow relation of birth control to our social problems, poverty, ignorance, crime and delinquency. If human life is sacred and it is a sin to kill, extinguish a life, then it is an even greater sin to call to existence a human life without the ability or the desire to provide for it, leaving procreation to blind instincts, a burden on the rest of society. According to our Constitution, a woman has the right to do with her body what she wants, and in our democratic society she

has the right to learn everything about her body and its working that she wants to know.

A Great Society cannot exist in a miserable world. As a privileged country we have the duty to come to the help of the less privileged ones. This is not only our moral obligation but our simplest self-interest. An increase in food production could have a favorable effect on social conditions only if it does not go parallel with an increase in the number of mouths which have to be fed.

There is ample evidence that birth control is possible without harmful effects to health and so the only obstacle in its way is ignorance, superstition and religious bigotry.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Maryland on his magnificent presentation of what is one of the most pressing problems of our time. No other Senator has done more than he to bring this subject to the attention of the American people, and, far beyond the American people, to the entire world.

We have achieved in the last 2 years a great breakthrough in bringing the importance and urgency of the population problem to the attention of mankind. The junior Senator from Maryland has made a great contribution, not merely in sponsoring and supporting other legislation which has been introduced previously, but also in introducing these two bills and one amendment which I am most happy to cosponsor.

The great change that has taken place in the last few months, and perhaps within the last year, is that the urgency

of this population problem is now apparent. It is a problem that has been swept under the rug in Congress prior to this time. The problem could not be freely discussed. All types of inhibitions prevented free public discussion of the matter. Now that situation has been changed.

The fundamental facts which have been brought out cannot be repeated too often. It took from the beginning of time, from Adam and Eve, to 1850 to bring the world's population to 1 billion people. Yet, a mere 75 years later that population had doubled, and it is now in the process of being doubled again in half that time. Discoveries in medicine, surgery, therapeutics, sanitation have brought that about. Unless we move rapidly and vigorously and purposefully, all the dire possibilities that the Senator so well foretells—strife, chaos, and starvation—will be inevitable.

It is pertinent that President Johnson has spoken publicly not fewer than 18 times since his election to the Presidency in favor of some action in this field.

These repeated statements and very vigorous injunctions by the President can be considered as mandates to the heads of his departments and agencies to do something about this problem.

Last year, in June, we received support from former President Eisenhower who, when President, thought this was a field in which government could not intrude. However, he pointed out in a letter to the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of which I am chairman, that he has changed his mind and feels that the matter is so pressing that the Government must intervene.

The two bills and one amendment which the junior Senator from Maryland is introducing will be extremely helpful.

I think it is essential to make use of the vast amount of counterpart funds which are lying idle in so many countries. We would not be meeting the problem of starvation solely by increasing the food supply because the food supply today is inadequate.

We must offer positive assistance to those countries wherein the number of consumers of food surpasses food supplies thereby causing widespread shortages and famines. Millions will die unless something is done about this deplorable situation. Unless that happens we will realize a diminution in our national resources and a shortage of all of the necessities of life. This situation will be aggravated unless we meet the problem head on.

I congratulate the junior Senator from Maryland, who has made a great contribution to the most important problem of our time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor. He has not yielded the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield shortly.

When the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] introduced legislation last year which provided for the establishment of an Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be responsible for the coordination of effort in the field of family planning, and also in the Department of State, to be responsible for efforts in the foreign field, he performed a great public service, not merely because he introduced the legislation, but also because he provided a forum for educators, economists, sociologists, demographers, and enlightened citizens to come in and point out the tremendous problems facing the world and our Nation. Each day, as distinguished witnesses testified before the Senator's subcommittee, a little more light was shed on this momentous problem.

I have here one statement which was made before his subcommittee as late as January 19 of this year. It is a statement of Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, a physician and the 1937 Nobel prize winner in medicine. I ask unanimous consent to have his entire statement printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to read at this point the first paragraph of the doctor's statement. It brings into focus the element of time, how important this problem is, and how necessary is action today.

He said:

Science has interfered with the order of nature by introducing death control. Women can now give birth to children, bring

them up without fear of death, and our own cities are depopulated no more by mysterious epidemics. This means a dangerous disturbance of an age-old balance. If the present population growth continues undisturbed, then, according to Sir Howard Florey president of the Royal Society and discoverer of penicillin, there will be 1 square yard available on the earth's surface for every human being in 600 years. If the acceleration of increase goes on, this stage will be reached much sooner, and men will have to kill.

I do not wish to imply that time has run out, but I do feel that the efforts of men like Senator GRUENING and Senator CLARK to try to focus public attention and to provide leadership is tremendously important. Senator GRUENING has been an inspiration to me since my arrival in the Senate last year. I was honored to be the first cosponsor of his vital, path-breaking legislation in this field, and I am very grateful to him for his remarks.

Now I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I join in the congratulations and commendations to the distinguished Senator from Maryland for the measures which he has introduced. I am honored to be one of those who has cosponsored them, as I previously have cosponsored the measures that have been offered by the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in this Congress and the previous Congress.

By their leadership, they are doing much to focus public attention upon this problem, and not only to focus public attention upon it, but to bring it out into the light of day, where we can seek and obtain the support necessary to write into law, as intelligent people realize it is necessary to write into law, such legislation for the benefit of the human race.

Mr. President, last Easter season, in April 1965, it was my privilege to be a member of the delegation from this Congress to the Inter-Parliamentary Union at Dublin, Ireland, at a meeting of representatives from 64 nations. My section was the economic situation, and it was my job to present our views. We took, as the United States views, the necessity for control of population to avert world war, famine, and disaster.

Practically everything said at that conference was objected to, and we had anticipated strong objections to our resolution. But to our surprise, there was unanimous agreement that this was a vital problem; and all the nations there represented voted for the resolution presented by the U.S. delegation, that the time had come for national and international effort in the field of birth control.

I, last week, had the privilege of offering amendments to the bill of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] dealing with our surplus agricultural commodities being shipped overseas. My amendments, which have been cosponsored by a number of Senators, were ordered to be left at the desk until March 1, and are still at the desk for further cosponsors, provide for furnishing, with the food supplied, information as to birth control, and allocating funds for this worthy purpose.

As one who has worked under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from

Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], following his leadership in the great hearings he has held, which have done more than any other one thing to focus attention of the people of America and of the European world, certainly, upon the urgency of this problem, I commend the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland for his very fine statement and his leadership in presenting these bills.

Mr. GRUENING. Will the Senator from Maryland yield so that I may ask unanimous consent to be shown as a cosponsor on the bill to which the distinguished Senator from Texas has referred, and which is now lying on the desk?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Alaska will be shown as a cosponsor on the next printing of the bill.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I had not planned to be present on the floor when the Senator from Maryland made his address. In fact, I had not known he anticipated making it today. But I have listened to it, and would feel somewhat a coward if I omitted commenting on it.

I was and am privileged to be a cosponsor of the Gruening bill to which the Senator from Maryland has made reference. I make no pretense of being a theologian, but I am a Roman Catholic, and seek to practice what my faith indicates to me is my own moral obligation. I wish I had had an opportunity to prepare remarks for this occasion, because I think there is great confusion across the country, not alone among my coreligionists, but among all of us, as to the difference between private morality and public policy. Perhaps if I survive the onslaught of incoming mail that I anticipate as a consequence of these remarks, the day will come when I will have an opportunity thoughtfully to prepare my impression of the distinction which should be drawn as between private morality and public policy.

I rise, Mr. President, to commend the Senator from Maryland upon this further discussion of what is and shall remain a matter of overriding public concern. I do not know what the year will be, whether it will be 3000 A.D. or 200 years, more or less, but conceivably the time will come when land space is used up. Does not the Government have some responsibility to anticipate that possibility, and develop a variety of programs which would be available, to be availed of depending upon one's moral judgment of what is acceptable and what is not?

I am not citing just a question of possible food shortage; this is a question of the atmosphere and environment in which human beings will live, and whether they can live in dignity or otherwise. It involves education, recreational resources, and other things. I think the state clearly has a responsibility to respond to that sort of problem,

certainly at least to identify it and to explain it.

I think that broad research and then widespread disclosure of the information that is developed with respect to family planning methods is an appropriate and reasonable response. I should make clear again, Mr. President, that one's use of the information and the techniques should depend on his own moral judgment as to their appropriateness for him. But this is a pluralistic society, as we are so frequently reminding each other, and it works both ways. It means that I do not require my neighbor to go to my church, and I am uncomfortable in getting into a position where I require my neighbor to solve social problems only my way.

There is a little bit of this involved here. As a practical suggestion, it would seem to me desirable that there be active participation by Roman Catholics in the development of these programs because then our proper concerns can be made clear at every stage and they will be better understood.

Mr. President, much critical mail that I have received from sincere Catholics following my cosponsorship of the Gruening bill was on the theme, often repeated, that what was there proposed is something which is morally wrong and that we have an affirmative obligation to oppose moral evil. This results, in part, which is not generally understood, whether it be the Gruening bill or the Tydings bill, that the effort, primarily, is to research and develop as broad an understanding as man's mind permits of the possibilities for responsible family planning. Everyone recognizes that there is a moral obligation of responsible parenthood. To say that the State has no business in this area I believe indicates some lack of appreciation of what is proposed.

I have heard no protest with respect to a Latin American nation which is busy with public moneys explaining the rhythm method. If that is all right, then what is wrong with what is proposed here? That again oversimplifies the issue, but it is not an irrelevant observation. It bears on the question of whether the State has any right at all in the area. Public money, thought, and position are involved in a good many areas where a great many people have moral reservations with respect to certain things which are discussed, described, and foretold. Certain of the family planning proposals that might develop—indeed some which are currently available—I believe I should not adopt. It does not necessarily follow that therefore the Government is wrong in responding with this research and information.

But here is an example of public money used in handling activity thought to be morally wrong. Many Senators remember their experiences as selectees or soldiers in military service. One of the first series of lectures we received was with respect to military hygiene or personal hygiene, as I recall it. It was in three chapters. First, were the techniques; second, the horrible examples; and, third, the chaplain. I am clear in my mind that adultery and fornication are

morally wrong in the judgment of a great many people, but this Government's action as I have outlined with respect to the subject has been accepted. Private morality and public policy clearly are balanced in this instance. I believe that the use of Federal funds to support those lectures is quite appropriate. Here again, whether it is the selectee with respect to the subject I have mentioned, or the married couple in the matter of family planning, they should decide with respect to what shall be done in light of their own moral conscience. In the area of family planning, I would not wish to impose my moral judgment on others, although I would expect to have my own moral reservations and rules respected and be permitted freely to follow them. That is what the Senator from Alaska, the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from Pennsylvania have always counseled, that we realize there must be no coercion, and that we must be clear as to the varied forms which coercion can take.

For example, a welfare recipient is especially subject to coercion. The circumstances and the setting are charged with this danger. Coercion can come also through ignorance; that is, one on welfare who may be medically ignorant is possibly also ignorant in a great many other areas requiring safeguards. To insure that there shall be no coercion in situations like that is particularly important. In the area of action by foreign governments, especially in the less developed countries, this problem will be real and acute, and must be recognized. I believe that all Senators who are giving leadership in this field recognize that.

Again, I believe that what we are talking about is a public, social response. It is a social value problem. We should not get that mixed up with the problem of private morality. There are certain things that Government cannot do, not just because it would be morally wrong but because they relate to social values, to individual human dignity.

For example, one would not propose a law to shoot down in cold blood the extra people in the world—whoever would define who would be extra—and not just because it would be morally wrong. It offends against human dignity, just as would abortion, which destroys nascent life.

Again, I wish very much one, that I had not been in the Chamber when the speech was given, and, two, had I known that it was going to be given, I would have had an opportunity more thoughtfully to prepare these responses. But, I rise to tell the Senator from Maryland, as I told the Senator from Alaska, that I believe this is the kind of discussion that will enable all of us more fully to respond to what becomes, is, and shall remain, a vastly important public question.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield, that I may make a comment to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to say to my friend, the Senator from Michigan, that if he had had all the time in the world to prepare his speech on this

problem concerning which he says he did not have an opportunity to think about beforehand, he could not have spoken more eloquently or with greater enlightenment. He has greatly clarified the situation for those who have listened to what we who have sponsored these bills have tried to say. His thoughtful and courageous comments make for an exercise in freedom of thought and freedom of choice. There never should be any element of compulsion involved in this issue. We know that there is great demand and great need for this information. All that the bill which I have introduced would do, and in which its 12 cosponsors, including the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maryland, have joined, would be to make the information available to those who wish it. The bill seeks at the same time, to meet the vastly urgent and pressing problem without the solution of which mankind will face dire consequences in the very near future.

The support of the Senator from Michigan—because of his enlightened stand, and because of his religious beliefs, which enable him to state that he carries on the moral principles of his church in his own way and in his own family, but does not preclude the desire to achieve freedom for all others whether they share his particular beliefs or not—is one of the most vital, one of the most useful, and one of the most inspiring contributions to this dialog.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Michigan on his contribution. He deserves great credit for his enlightenment and his courage.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield now to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to join my friend from Alaska—and I know my friend from Maryland will participate too—in commending the Senator from Michigan not only for what he has just said, but for his cosponsorship of the bill of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. I agree it was a wise and fine comment that he made. I agree he could not have done better if he had thought it over for a couple of months. But I think we all should appreciate the courage it took him to say what he did publicly and to put himself in the position in which he has placed himself. It is not an easy thing to do.

The Senator from Michigan could have remained silent. Nobody would have rebuked him. But I think it is a wonderful thing to have a man of the stature of the Senator from Michigan, being a devout believer in the religion to which he attaches himself, to make the comments he did this morning.

I would like to suggest to my friend the Senator from Michigan that he should be of good cheer, for he does not stand alone in his religious community. I recall the great courage of Dr. John Rock, the well-known Catholic gynecologist, professor emeritus of Harvard University; but, more than that, we should note what members of the hierarchy themselves have said. I have occasion to remember what Richard

Cardinal Cushing, head of the Catholic Church in New England, said in connection with the repeal of the Massachusetts law which prevented the sale of contraceptives. He said Catholics do not seek to impose their moral views on others. It was magnificent of him to say it.

I also well recall the review in the New York Times of Dr. Rock's book. I say this as a Unitarian, but I say this is the view of the more enlightened members of the Catholic Church, one of the greatest laymen, in my opinion, of whom is the Senator from Michigan.

If I may, I should like to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Maryland about a couple of matters he spoke about.

First, I am delighted he has made his speech. I think the Senator from Alaska will agree with me that we came to the conclusion, within a few months of the Senator from Maryland's becoming a Member of this body, that he was articulate, aggressive, and diligent. I am delighted he is publicizing a matter which has been for so long brushed under the rug on the floor of the Senate.

I can speak only for myself, but I think the Senator from Alaska will agree with me, when I say that what the Senator from Maryland has so succinctly said and with courage has been enormously enlightening.

I wonder if the Senator agrees with me that the cause which the four of us who are alone on the Senate floor at the present time—with the exception of the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]—have been discussing has had the wraps taken off this matter; that we have been making extraordinary progress in the 3 or 4 years since the present subject was first discussed publicly on the floor of the Senate. I think we can all agree that is so.

The Senator from Alaska has held hearings which have received a great deal of publicity. That really knocked the top off the bottle. Now the Senator from Maryland has made what I think are really fine proposals here.

I would hope that both the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Alaska will give some careful, thoughtful consideration as to whether they do not want to go before the Committee on Foreign Relations, when it considers the foreign aid bill in an open session later this year with what I know will be carefully thought out arguments and testimony as to why the bill of the Senator from Maryland should receive the careful consideration of the members of the committee, both in the authorization and in the appropriations, in the help that it needs.

History shows that we will have more trouble with the Appropriations Committee than with the Foreign Relations Committee.

Then I make another suggestion: that in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare we have not only a Subcommittee on Health, the chairman of which is the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], but a Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, which I have the honor to head.

It occurs to me that the domestic aspects of the family planning problem have very real and direct implications on the whole manpower and employment problems of our own country. I would be only too happy to make that committee available, if I can, to the Senators from Alaska and Maryland, and have them have an opportunity to testify further with respect to the manpower implications of the proposed legislation.

I wonder how my friend from Maryland would respond to that suggestion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say first to the distinguished Senator that news that he, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, would be willing to hold hearings is tremendously good news. It is better than I had hoped for, to be quite frank.

Mr. CLARK. If I may interrupt the Senator for a moment, I am not sure whether the bill will be referred to it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it would be referred to the committee. If the bill is referred in the normal routine of business, it should be referred to the committee of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The second measure, referring to foreign assistance funds, unquestionably would go to the Foreign Relations Committee. My third measure, amendments to S. 2933, would go to the committee of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He has already indicated he is going to hold hearings on the bill. I think it would be helpful if we could have hearings on the bill before the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but, in any event, any hearings would be tremendously helpful for the purposes of this legislation.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to have that response from my friend.

I wonder if he would look with favor on the following suggestion. The Senator made reference in his speech to the recommendation of a very distinguished panel on population, the chairman of which is a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Richard Gardner. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to join me in getting unanimous consent that the recommendations of this panel, which included a recommendation for an expenditure of \$100 million a year for 3 years on the population problem, may be included at the end of the Senator's speech.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that would be entirely appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the matters which has not had much discussion on the floor of the Senate and which is a very ticklish one, indeed—but knowing my friend from Maryland, I do not think he will run away from it—is the vexing problem as to whether contraceptive information should be furnished to women who either are not married or who are not living with their husbands. Over in the OEO—

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will yield at that point for one moment, I

would like at this time to comment on that point and on some of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. They are both dealt with in the legislation I have introduced.

Taking first the point raised by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, I specifically wrote into my proposed legislation that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could not refuse a grant to a local applicant or local agency because the applicant would provide family planning assistance which is limited in scope such as might be the case at Mercy Hospital in Baltimore, or any other Catholic hospital. Nor could an applicant be denied a grant under my bill because that particular applicant might provide information on medical assistance to married or unmarried women.

It would preclude the situation which occurred in OEO, where an administrative decision was made in Washington that a grant would not be permitted to UPO, a local antipoverty organization, because OEO did not agree with the way they planned to operate their family planning program.

In response to the points made by the Senator from Michigan, I would like to read specifically the protections against coercion or depriving an individual of his religious or philosophical right to exercise free choice. Section 2(a) of my bill provides:

SEC. 2. (a) Grants under this Act shall be made only under regulations promulgated by the Secretary. No grant shall be approved unless it contains and is supported by reasonable assurances that in carrying out any program assisted by any such grant, the applicant—

That refers to the local applying agency, whether a local public agency, a private nonprofit organization, or a Catholic hospital—

will establish and follow procedures designed to insure that—

(1) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical or religious beliefs; and

(2) no individual will be provided any medical supervision or supplies unless such individual has voluntarily filed a written request with the applicant asking for such medical supervision or supplies.

Further, as to the question which the Senator from Michigan posed, whereby an indigent family might be coerced into seeking family planning information by use of welfare checks or other means, section 8(b) provides:

(b) The use of family planning services provided by the applicant under such grant shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs of financial or medical assistance.

In other words, we tried to write into the proposed legislation all of the protections to safeguard the freedoms of choice which we all feel are so vital and important in this area.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am, of course, in complete agreement with the Senator on the point he has made, but I am very much

concerned about the attitude of OEO in this regard.

I have had dealings and some conversations with Mr. Sargent Shriver's office who takes the adamant position that he will not authorize a grant to any applicant such as Planned Parenthood unless they can assure him that contraceptives will not be made available unless it is proven that it goes only to individuals living in wedlock.

I think there is a real question here. I do not think this is black and white.

In Philadelphia, where I happen to know something about the poverty program, the local community action people are most anxious to have one or more of the civic institutions, which are ready to make available this information, given a grant by the OEO. But they have been told categorically that unless it is clear that the actual medical services are confined to those living in wedlock they are not going to get the grant. They are fudging around with their budget and in private areas, trying to fix things up so that without using government funds, they can make devices available on a voluntary basis to those individuals whom the people running the poverty program are absolutely convinced are the ones who need it most.

I know from my experience as the Mayor of Philadelphia that we are not going to solve the problem of overcrowding of slums—not that I think this particular factor is going to solve it, but it will make a contribution—and there is not going to be a real impact on what can be done by family planning in poverty-stricken areas or can be done to rehabilitate the unfortunate people, who are having a child every year and do not know how not to do it, unless OEO revises those standards.

I wish to use this opportunity on the floor of the Senate to plead with Mr. Shriver to change his point of view so that we can make a real impact where it is most needed in the big urban ghettos of the country.

How does my friend from Maryland react to that suggestion?

Mr. TYDINGS. As I explained to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I specifically wrote into legislation which I propose in connection with these specific grants for family planning, that no one in Washington could withhold grants to local agencies purely for the reason that the local agency gave assistance to unwed mothers as well as to married mothers.

So far as the situation with the OEO is concerned, although I personally would have acted differently had I been in Mr. Shriver's position, nevertheless it is a little different situation. The sole purpose and the reason for my legislation is to move in the field of family planning, to provide these services particularly to the medically indigent, the poor, who cannot afford them. Many of these persons are unwed mothers. Mr. Shriver has a responsibility and an obligation to administer one of the most controversial programs this country has seen since New Deal days. He is under fire from all directions, all areas, and in all aspects of this program.

His support in Congress has not always been as solid as it might have been. Therefore, I can appreciate that he might tread hesitatingly in some areas which might be controversial. I do not intend to use this forum to criticize him for those decisions, although I would have made them differently.

I wrote into this bill safeguards so that the local agency applying would determine the delicate question of eligibility for family planning assistance.

Mr. CLARK. I understand the point of view of the Senator from Maryland and to some extent I am sympathetic with him.

It occurs to me that the Senator from Alaska and I should give thought to whether or not we should sponsor amendments to the poverty program legislation to give it the same authority, freedom, and flexibility which the Senator from Maryland would like to see as a result of the legislation he is presently sponsoring for HEW.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether in his discussion with the Office of Economic Opportunity he has been able to find the reason why Sargent Shriver opposes it.

Mr. CLARK. I believe I can answer that question.

Mr. GRUENING. It seems to me that there is a moral decision involved in giving contraceptive information to unwed mothers. It could be a moral question with respect to the unwed mothers—who are what is known as "living in sin" and, of course, one would want them to sin no more.

Mr. CLARK. I think that that depends upon the definition of "to sin."

I think that Mr. Shriver's position was illustrated by the Senator from Maryland when he indicated the political problems in connection with the administration of the poverty program. I think that the difficulty with Mr. Shriver is that he finds the potato too hot to handle.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for one further comment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator knows, AID has taken huge strides in its point of view toward family planning in the use of its funds overseas. I feel certain that they were heartened by various comments made by the President, who again spoke out, in my judgment, with great courage and foresight.

But while AID is at present giving technical assistance and is engaging in demographic studies and offering advice, it still holds back from either furnishing devices or providing funds to assist in the manufacture of devices overseas. I am not too sure that those restrictions are particularly meaningful. It seems to me a little like saying, "Mother, may I go out to swim?" "Yes, my darling daughter. Hang your clothes on the hickory limb, but do not go near the water."

I wonder whether the Senator from Maryland has any views on this point,

or indeed whether his proposed legislation would authorize the AID administration either to furnish devices or to furnish funds for the manufacture of devices overseas.

Mr. TYDINGS. My bill is designed to provide a little more gumption to the administration of the AID program—to insert a little more iron in the backbone of the administration of the program—by indicating that we in the Senate want the AID administration to move ahead. With respect to the specific point raised by the Senator from Pennsylvania, in both my amendment to the food-for-freedom bill and my amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, I provide:

The term "voluntary family planning program" includes, but is not limited to, demographic studies, medical and psychological research, personnel training, the construction and staffing of clinics and rural health centers, specialized training of doctors and paramedical personnel, the manufacture of medical supplies, and the dissemination of family planning information, medical supervision, and supplies to individuals who desire such assistance.

That language is specifically written into the law to cover just the areas about which the Senator from Pennsylvania has spoken.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from Maryland upon the drafting of a bill which might move this program forward. In saying this, I do not wish, even by implication, to criticize the AID Administration, or Mr. David Bell, its Administrator. I consider the research that they started a few years ago to be forthright and courageous.

Again, I congratulate the Senator from Maryland upon the splendid talk he has made and the fine bills he has introduced. I associate myself with his point of view and thank him for permitting me to be a cosponsor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of all these considerations, the Committee on Population makes the following recommendations:

1. That the U.S. Government encourage schools and universities here and abroad to study population in all its relevant aspects—particularly at the graduate level in relation to such fields as medicine, public health, public administration, theology, economics and other behavioral sciences.
2. That the U.S. Government greatly expand its support, both at home and abroad, of research related to the population problem—particularly research on the interrelation between population growth and economic development, on new or improved techniques of family planning, on the means of communicating these techniques, and on the administration and management of family planning programs.
3. That the U.S. Government set an international example by cooperating with State and local governments and private organizations to make family planning services and information readily available to those in the United States who wish to have them, with the understanding that there be no coercion and that in tax-supported facilities there be full freedom of choice of methods to be used in regulating pregnancy.
4. That the U.S. Government greatly expand its program of training U.S. and foreign

personnel who can themselves train doctors, auxiliary personnel, communications specialists, administrators, and others needed in the implementation of family planning programs in the United States and around the world.

5. That the U.S. Government be prepared to make available upon request up to \$100 million a year over the next 3 years to help other countries implement programs of family planning and strengthen national health and social services necessary for the support of family planning programs.

6. That U.S. assistance to other countries in all of these areas be related to the maximum possible extent to the work of multilateral agencies, particularly the relevant agencies of the United Nations, including the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, and the United Nations development program.

7. That private organizations be encouraged to expand their work in all of these areas, particularly in those fields where Government assistance is not readily available and that public and private sources be encouraged to give more generous support to such organizations.

8. That a White House Conference on Population be held within the next 2 years to consider domestic and international population trends and the appropriate measures to deal with them.

9. That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appoint a committee to prepare this Conference through careful advance planning and research and to advise the U.S. Government on steps that may be taken before the Conference to deal with domestic and international population problems.

10. That the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare undertake improvements in organization, staff, and budgets necessary to discharge their increased responsibilities pursuant to the above recommendations.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL WOULD GIVE ADVANCE CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL TO THE PRESIDENT TO WAGE A WIDER, OPEN-ENDED UNDECLARED WAR ANYWHERE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, S. 2791, the supplemental procurement and construction authorization bill now before the Senate, will plunge the United States into an unlimited war in Asia.

It is a blank check for unlimited escalation.

It will place absolute power without limit or restraint in the hands of the President and the Secretary of Defense.

CXII—271—Part 4

If enacted, Congress will have abdicated all authority over the war-making powers vested in it by the Constitution.

S. 2791 will establish the final point of no return by which the people of the United States have been led—indeed, misled—into the bloodiest, and most needless holocaust in our history.

The New York Times in its lengthy dispatch from Saigon places the prospective U.S. casualties at 400 to 500 dead a month and 15,000 wounded.

We may expect that these figures are understated, based on merely the present enemy resistance. They do not take into account the concomitant enemy escalation, leading inevitably, as the Mansfield report warned, into an open end war—that is with no end in sight.

While we are sending our finest young men to be slaughtered, we learn that in 1965, not less than 96,000 men deserted from the South Vietnamese Army. Our boys are to take the place of and to give their lives for a people who do not want to fight for their own cause.

S. 2791 is represented as a simple authorization bill to supply the needs of our men at the front.

But it goes far, far, beyond that.

It is a policymaking bill which commits the United States to do anything anywhere, to support all forces of other nations—our alleged allies—indefinitely.

It commits the United States on a scale unprecedented in our history.

It will keep the people of the United States in ignorance of where they are being led. Their only participation will be to send their sons to their death and to pay the staggering costs.

Only those who have carefully read the House and Senate hearings on this bill will understand how far along the road to world war III this bill will push the United States.

I hope that before voting on S.2791 we shall all have read carefully the excellent analysis of the bill's far-reaching implications made on the floor on Friday, February 25, 1966, by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE.]

I shall go into further details at a later time in this debate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, today's Washington Post contains the results of a poll by the Harris group. This poll deals with the handling of the war in Vietnam.

It appears from the poll at first blush that there is less approval of the President's policy with regard to the war than there previously was. This result is occasioned because there are four different positions that people take. It is impossible for the President to take all four of these positions. There are varying degrees of thought on this subject.

It is interesting to note how the people think about this. Based on the movement of American sentiment, more are in favor of a stronger line than there were when Congress convened in January. I notice that, of those who were not sure what our position should be, there is now an increase from 7 percent to 8 percent.

The percentage of so-called doves, those who disagree and want to pull out, is unchanged. It was 9 percent in January and is 9 percent in February.

When one looks at the percentage of those who agree but who say, "Do more to negotiate," that percentage has declined according to the poll from 39 percent to 34 percent. There has been a very decided loss among those who agree, but favor taking a soft line, and say they would do more than the President is doing in an effort to negotiate. These people recognize the fact that the President has been making every effort to negotiate. It is not the fault of this Nation that there has been no negotiation. It is the fault of the Communist powers.

The next category consists of those who agree but who favor an increase in the military effort. The percentage is the same, 33 percent in February as against 33 percent in January.

The big increase occurs in those who disagree with the President's policy of carrying the war more to the north and say: "If you are going to send your men there, fight. If you are going to fight, fight to win." That is where the increase occurs. The increase is from 12 percent to 16 percent.

If one looks at the overall poll, he will note that those who want to pursue the soft line are declining in number and that those who want to pursue a harder line, in opposition to the Communists, are increasing in number.

I predict that, as the American people have always united behind their men on the field of battle when the Nation is in danger, we will see an increase in this trend as time goes by, notwithstanding what anyone states on the television or what anyone does to confuse the people of this country.

I believe that the people in the South are more inclined that way than are people in other sections of the country. They believe that in time of peril or danger we must unite behind our Nation and our fighting men on the field of battle. Our people are not soft on communism. They have no desire to live under communism. The trend in favor of victory over communism is growing stronger.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will not yield for a comment, but I shall yield for a question.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, does the Senator not know that there are those who disagree with his statement that our country is in danger? That is the vital issue.

In the opinion of many of us, including the Senator from Alaska, our country is not in danger. Our country has not been menaced. On the contrary, we are barging into a foreign war in Asia where our security is not jeopardized.

I believe, indeed I know, that, if we were in danger, the people would rally as we did in World War I and World War II. We would, of course, do so again. However, many of us feel that our security is in no wise impaired and that our country is not in danger.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator is entitled to his view. The Senator is one of the 2—of the approximately 500 people who voted on the joint resolution—who voted against the resolution. That resolution provided that we should support whatever measures the President found necessary to resist aggression.

It is well to point out that a far larger number of people believe that we are not pursuing a strong enough course than believe we are doing too much.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I, of course, intend to vote for the military authorization now before the Senate, because there is really no alternative.

President Johnson is wisely holding to a middle course in the conduct of the war in Vietnam—

The Houston Chronicle states in a recent editorial, and it adds:

The administration policy remains a two-pronged policy of limited war. It is designed to punish the Communist enemy while bolstering economic and social reforms in South Vietnam. It is designed to exert enough military pressure but not too much, to hit the enemy troops and installations and to convince them that they can't win by force. The level of military action, it is hoped, will not have to be greatly stepped up. Moreover, the policy recognizes that, when the desired negotiated peace finally comes to Vietnam, it will be the people, by free election, who must decide who they want to govern.

The Chronicle concludes that this policy "seems to be the wisest and most practical course that has yet been offered."

Our flag is committed in Vietnam; our young men are fighting there. For me, therefore, there is no alternative but to support our flag and our young men and to uphold the hand of the man upon whose shoulders this onerous burden rests, the President of the United States.

Because others will want to read this article from beginning to end, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle,
Feb. 17, 1966]

NEITHER HAWK NOR DOVE

Despite the continuing criticism from two opposite directions, President Johnson is wisely holding to a middle course in the conduct of the war in Vietnam. The hardliners—the hawks—think he isn't pushing hard and fast enough in pursuit of victory. The softliners—the doves—think he is bent on escalation and possibly eventual war with Red China. As the clamor from opposing sides rises, the President's policy looks increasingly calm, restrained, and reasonable.

The recent fire from the softliners has come mainly from the televised hearings of Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT's Senate Foreign Relations Committee. George F. Kennan, diplomat and historian, came out strong for a policy of restraint. He, like Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, supports the "enclave" theory of digging in and waiting for a political solution to emerge—of preventing any deliberate expansion of the war. Kennan believes that southeast Asia isn't the theater from which the United States can best fight a war against Red China.

On the other hand, former Senator Barry Goldwater has little sympathy with Mr. Johnson's recent peace offensive. He calls it "groveling" and says he doesn't think "it's our job to get the Communists to the peace table by begging. * * * We'll get the Hanoi government to the conference table when we convince them that we have the will to attack and that we are attacking them."

President Johnson, significantly, points out that he agrees with those who are against escalation, but he sees some increase in the fighting as virtually inevitable. "No one wants to escalate the war and no one wants to lose any more men than is necessary," he explains. "No one wants to surrender and get out. * * * At least no one admits they do."

Thus, the administration policy remains a two-pronged policy of limited war. It is designed to punish the Communist enemy while bolstering economic and social reforms in South Vietnam. It is designed to exert enough military pressure but not too much, to hit the enemy troops and installations and to convince them that they can't win by force. The level of military action, it is hoped, will not have to be greatly stepped up. Moreover, the policy recognizes that, when the desired negotiated peace finally comes to Vietnam, it will be the people, by free election, who must decide who they want to govern.

While this Johnson policy of war, but limited war, is not perfect and while it is open to valid criticism from both the impatient hawks and the fearful doves, still it seems to be the wisest and most practical course that has yet been offered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMINGTON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUE. 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. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on Saturday I called the Senate into session. I sent wires to 100 Senators that if they had speeches to make, they ought to come and make those speeches.

This is a very vital matter, providing necessary arms, food and weapons to our men who are in Vietnam, fighting for this country.

This is an urgent matter and should be passed immediately. It has been dragging on for almost two and a half weeks now, going on into 3 weeks since the majority leader announced that this matter would be the next pending business and that it would be laid before the Senate. Senators have had almost 3 weeks now to prepare speeches on this measure. I would be glad to yield right now to any Senator who says he is ready to make a speech. I took the responsibility of assuring those who are delaying this matter that I would not ask for a vote, and, in fact, would see to it that no vote would come until 4 o'clock, because they are now in a meeting discussing strategy. It seems to me they should meet today and some in here and make their speeches.

We are still waiting for them. I do not believe they have made more than a 3-minute statement today. If Senators want to filibuster they should come

in here and filibuster, but they should not expect us to wait forever for them to make speeches which they are not prepared to make.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The yeas and nays on this question were ordered on Saturday. I therefore ask, What is there to prevent our calling for a quorum and proceeding to vote?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be glad to, but on this particular occasion I have avoided, as the Senator knows, making any definite commitments. The fact is, a meeting is being held now by those who are delaying the bill, to decide on how to proceed, and therefore I would not like to permit the Senate to vote between now and 4 o'clock. Therefore, if there is no Senator who wishes to make a speech, I suppose we will have to recess from now until 4 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I regret that the Senator from Louisiana finds himself in this position, but I can understand how the acting majority leader can easily be placed in such a position, in order to protect Members of the Senate. It does seem to me, however, that this is a sorry spectacle and should be brought to a conclusion.

I do not believe that what is going on will cause the American people to swell with pride about the Senate. I do not even believe it adds any credit to the stature of representative government around the world, that in the middle of a war we still debate whether we should be in the war. This has been going on for 18 or 19 days now. I hope that in the future the Senator from Louisiana will tell those who are carrying on this filibuster that they must protect their own interests on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have avoided making any definite commitments on many occasions. I did make such a commitment to help those who have been delaying this matter to be in the Chamber. As the Senator knows, frankly, on Saturday, if some of those who are in favor of this resolution, particularly on the Republican side of the aisle, had not seen fit to delay the matter for 15 minutes, we would have gone ahead and agreed to vote on the matter because those delaying the matter were not here and did not wish the Senate to vote. We left word that nothing would happen, so that they could come back from somewhere else, if they wished to delay it. In justice to their country, they should go ahead and vote on a matter so vital as providing help to our men in Vietnam, help which they need right now.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. May I say we have had a bill before us for almost 3 weeks now. So far as I can recall, with the exception of two Senators who voted against the original Tonkin Gulf resolution, no Senator has brought

forth any alternative to what we are proposing. So I suppose these Senators are now meeting and trying to frame some alternative. They are just against, against, against. I have asked them repeatedly to bring forward some alternative. Let us examine it. If there is any better course to take in the interest of the United States, let us have it on the floor and all the Members of the Senate may discuss it. But in time of war, when 300,000 American boys are in the combat area and we are having to increase the draft call to find replacements for those units that have gone overseas and for those who have paid the supreme sacrifice in Vietnam, it does seem to me we should have something better to offer the Senate than a mere objection. There should be some alternative procedure put forward for the consideration of the American people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that the same thing would apply to this matter, but they are just fiddling and faddling, that we should tell the Vietcong this, that we should suggest to the Secretary this, and to the Commander in Chief that. But the Vietcong does not want to negotiate with us, not so long as they can defeat us.

I will yield the floor right now if any Senator wishes to speak.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Georgia.

To me, it also seems incredible that the people of this country would be witnessing these developments in the Senate.

This morning I placed in the RECORD a headline from the press, "U.S. Paratrooper Company Beaten Decisively."

Regardless of any particular feelings any of us may have about the ideological aspects or rights of the war, or what they would or would not do if they had the authority, they should realize that today, from their State, as well as from my State, and from the State of every other Senator, men are fighting and dying in the cause of freedom. This delay can only result in increased casualties.

I would hope that we would get over the delay over this bill, and give these young men and women of America what they need in Vietnam, which in turn will give them the best opportunity to return home alive and well.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that there is an alternative. I heard the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] make the statement—and I yield to no one in my respect for him. I state this only for information. Let me say to him that this alternative has been made by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and myself. It is Senate Joint Resolution No. 134 which we introduced on January 20, 1966.

By way of discussion, incidentally, I identify myself with my colleagues on

this vote. We should vote. If the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] wishes to undo the resolution of August 1964—which I believe would be a mistake, because it would repudiate the President in the eyes of the world—then let him put it up and let us vote it up or down. The amendment which the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] states that he intends to offer on draftees, would be a great mistake, in my opinion. I will vote against them both, but let us vote them up or down. I do not believe that I need to apologize for my support of the President's policy to date. I do believe that the deep disquiet in the country relates to things which we could answer if the President allowed us to consider a resolution that he might propose to us to replace the one of August 1964.

I believe that resolution is out of date, that it was a power of attorney given to the President for a certain purpose, to meet the Gulf of Tonkin situation.

We can always pass a resolution, but I believe the general feeling here would be that in the face of a war situation, if a resolution were passed that the President has not asked for, it would downgrade the President's control of the foreign policy of our country, which would put us in an embarrassing and difficult position.

Perhaps, if there had been no resolution at all, then we would be arguing about it in a different way, but there was a resolution. The real objection is that that resolution is now out of date.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and myself wish to concentrate attention on the social and economic reconstruction of South Vietnam, which the President has already emphasized at Honolulu. We would give attention to the order of magnitude of the resources which we would be willing to devote to the struggle, under present circumstances, which would have an effect—we cannot all be armchair generals—but which would have the effect on the totality of the commitment undertaken.

Of course, it can be put on this authorization bill; and it could be voted up or down; but, frankly, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I, who have been considering such a step, would be reluctant, except in extremis, to do it. We would rather have the President suggest one. I am one of those who has been supporting the President. I think, in view of the fact that the President does have a resolution, many people would like to have this declaration updated in view of events.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I only point out that I did not refer to the Senator. I said those who are opposing the resolution should bring forward some alternative to the pending authorization if it is not agreeable to them. I am familiar with the resolution of the Senator. I do not think I can vote for it in totality, but he has brought it here in good faith. I was referring to those who object but who are not offering alternatives.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, has that matter been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Was it subject to discussion at all during the recent hearings?

Mr. JAVITS. No. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] refused to have hearings on that motion. Perhaps there are others who felt that way. I can understand why. He is concerned about denigrating the position of the President, the man who is charged under the Constitution with our foreign policy. Unless the President requests one, we would be reluctant to offer one, except in extremis. I am not prepared at the moment to say that there is that much of a break between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. I would rather have something put forward that is constructive, and have the President come forward with some idea of his own. On the other hand, I think there is dissatisfaction in the country over this resolution, because it is out of date, and we think there should be another expression, so that we could at least join the President in what is the policy of the country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think the acting majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Georgia will join me in saying that this matter has been discussed, as to whether or not there should be something definite placed before the Congress, which might reiterate the feelings of any of those who might be opposed or for it. I think the matter is still under active discussion. I do not think there is any disposition on the part of the President not to come before the Congress in this particular case and consult with us, or have us consult with him, or even have them suggest something. I think he would be the last one to suggest that that should not happen.

But, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, we have had much advice and no answers. We have had many questions, but no answers.

I think the RECORD ought to be clear about what happened last Saturday. The Senator from Louisiana and I discussed the matter on Thursday. It was discussed with other Senators. We said, "Fine. If anyone has anything to add to the debate on this particular question, we shall be glad to hear them."

I was busy on a bill Saturday, but I said I could come to the floor in 5 minutes if a Senator had anything to say. No Senator apparently had anything to say. This is important. It is not very comfortable to the troops who are in Vietnam, or to those in other parts of the world, or the people in the United States, to read that the Senate cannot agree on whether military support shall be granted to our troops there.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The bill, in effect, asking for additional support for our military was introduced into the Senate over a month ago, on the 19th of January. All of these delays tie into the same general disagreement. I would urge that we get on with this matter, and as soon as possible.

I would associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Washington. It is creating a most unfavorable impression all around the world.

Recent polls show a large majority of the American people are behind the President, even though some of our colleagues apparently still do not wish to act.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the session was called last Saturday to give Senators who wanted to speak an opportunity to make whatever speeches they wished to make. I sent a wire to every one of the 100 Senators, including myself, to make sure that we would all receive wires, that if they had speeches to make they should come and make them. We adjourned because of a lack of a quorum. In my judgment, we could have gotten a quorum.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is on the floor. He suggested a quorum. We discussed the matter. He would have been willing to withhold that suggestion if we could have had any Senator come here to make a speech. There again I suspected that those who did not want to vote did not want to make speeches, either. Those Senators, it appears, do not want to make their speeches and will not vote.

If I may say so, it is even more than a filibuster, because during a filibuster we at least make speeches. Those who are engaging in a filibuster make speeches. If they do not want to vote, at least they ought to speak.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it is pretty well recognized that what we are concerned about is erosion of domestic support for the President's policy. I think, in all frankness, the troops who are in South Vietnam are not going to be out of ammunition and guns because we have delayed passing the supplemental authorization bill in the last 2 weeks. But I do think that responsibility demands that we should move with vigor and alacrity in pursuing the purposes of the United States. So I join my colleagues in urging it. I couple that statement with the fact that I hope the President will seek the urgent support of the Congress and the people. I believe that he should bring forward a new resolution or ask Congress for a new expression on this matter and update the resolution of 1964, which has resulted in vexing debate and in much free speech.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no exact idea, but I know this is a matter which has been discussed in the Senate for some time.

Mr. JAVITS. I would say to my colleagues that I join with them in their anxiety to get a vote, because it is beginning to look unseemingly in the eyes of the world and the people of this country and to our own troops over there that we are not acting yet.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to say to the Senator, in respect to what he said about the 2 weeks and that the troops are

not going to be out of ammunition because we have not voted in the 2 weeks, that the Senator and the rest of us have been around the military for some time, and we know that while it may be 2 weeks at the beginning, it may be 2 months at the other end.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is another side to this question. This morning I submitted evidence before the Foreign Relations Committee that there are specific problems that have to be taken care of.

I have great respect for my friend from New York. We rarely disagree on this subject. Based on information given to me, unless we go forward now, we will be responsible for additional casualties in Vietnam.

If the Senator from New York does not agree, I hope he will give me opportunity to show him information I possess on this subject.

Mr. JAVITS. On this I agree with the Senator, but I base my plea not only on his expertise, which I respect greatly, but also because I believe it is not appropriate, in a situation as critical as this to our troops, our Nation, and the world, to carry this along further.

Mr. SYMINGTON. To which I wholeheartedly agree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Here is the need of the bill on Vietnam, and that is the supplemental aid bill for the Vietnamese Government. I would appreciate it if the Senator would look at it to understand how urgent it is. They are trying to get the bill out of the Foreign Relations Committee now.

This bill has been in committee for almost 3 weeks.

I would hope that we could vote on the matter. If anyone wishes to discuss this subject or any other, I will yield the floor. Otherwise, I suggest that we recess until 4 o'clock because I made a commitment that the Senate would not vote until 4 o'clock.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object, is there an agreement that there will be a vote at 4 o'clock?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, I have no agreement, I regret to say. This is one of the few times I made a commitment that I would not ask for a vote before 4 o'clock. I have declined to make similar commitments during the previous week, but those who have been delaying this bill are having discussions about what their procedure will be. In fairness, I felt it should be at 4 o'clock. I made that commitment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was trying to get information as to a reasonable prospect of a vote or are we still discussing it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it would serve the same purpose if I suggested the absence of a quorum.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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. THURMOND. Mr. President, from all reports, the morale of the U.S. Armed Forces fighting in Vietnam is excellent. It should be a matter of concern to all Members of this body that their morale remains excellent. It is all too easy for both public officials and members of the public to overlook the fact that both our words and actions can and do have an impact upon the morale of our fighting forces.

There has recently come to my attention a booklet entitled "Soldier Management and Morale," issued in 1953 or 1954 by the U.S. Army, Europe, and personally written by Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, then commander-in-chief, U.S. Army Reserve, Europe. This booklet is still in use in the Army.

The section of this booklet entitled "Outside Influence on Morale" is, in my opinion, very pertinent to all Americans, particularly to those in official positions of our Government who have any concern for the morale of our fighting forces. The section on "Outside Influence on Morale" reads as follows:

The factors, adjuncts, and indications of morale covered so far have to do with those things that are generally within the ability of the military leadership and management to influence. But there are influences on the morale of soldiers, especially those on duty in a far-off land, which stem from attitudes of officials, Members of Congress, the press, radio commentators, and the public at home. These factors have to do with the last two elements of the basic premise: (2) An important job, (3) and receiving recognition.

It is necessary that the soldier feel that he is needed where he is in an important mission, that his sacrifices are of both immediate and of long-range benefit to his country, his home, his family, and himself. He will feel that importance so long as the people at home feel it. He is very sensitive to public opinion at home and, because of good radio, newspaper, and mail facilities, is constantly abreast of the attitude at home toward the importance of his job. The hometown and other releases by information officers play an important part in the attitude at home. Unless the people at home help maintain in him the feeling that he is doing an important job for them, the heart of the basic premise upon which good morale is built is eliminated. Then the several adjuncts to morale cannot fully fill the void regardless of the efforts made.

The third element—"receiving recognition"—generally follows from the second, insofar as the attitude of the public is concerned. Visits, speeches and actions of officials, articles by newspaper correspondents and contents of letters which the soldier receives from home all affect morale. Because of this, every citizen shares with the military leaders the responsibility for the morale of the service personnel.

This little booklet then states in summary:

The morale of a man in a military organization comes from many factors. It may well be summed up in one word, "confidence." Confidence in his training, equipment, leadership, in himself, in his unit, and in the support from home. The military commanders play a big part in it but so do civilian officials, Members of Congress, the press, radio commentators, and the general public at home. Together they must insure that the soldier does well at an important job and receives recognition for it. So long

as this is accomplished there is a general feeling of confidence, well-being, and progress in a military unit; and the report which states that the "morale is excellent" will be sound.

Mr. President, there is no question that the debate now taking place in the Senate has a major relation to the morale of our forces in Vietnam. Not only the military supplies which would be authorized under the pending legislation, but also the morale of American servicemen is seriously involved in this current debate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 39 Leg.]

Aiken	Hartke	Mundt
Allott	Hayden	Murphy
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bartlett	Hill	Nelson
Bass	Holland	Neuberger
Bayh	Hruska	Pastore
Bennett	Inouye	Pearson
Bible	Jackson	Prouty
Boggs	Javits	Proxmire
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, S.C.
Cannon	Kuchel	Russell, Ga.
Case	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Clark	Long, La.	Scott
Cooper	Magnuson	Simpson
Cotton	Mansfield	Smathers
Curtis	McCarthy	Smith
Dirksen	McClellan	Sparkman
Dominick	McGee	Stennis
Douglas	McGovern	Symington
Eastland	McIntyre	Talmadge
Ervin	McNamara	Thurmond
Fannin	Metcalf	Tower
Fong	Mondale	Tydings
Fulbright	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Gruening	Morse	Yarborough
Harris	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Moss	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a very few minutes. The only point that I have in mind has already been brought out once in debate, but perhaps what I have to say will spell out the figures a little better.

The pending bill, as everyone knows, is for authorization of military funds. Last year, the appropriation bill and the authorization bill carried \$1.7 billion for the war in Vietnam. When those calculations were made and that figure arrived at, the Department of Defense assumed that there would be an additional authorization not later than the 28th day of February 1966. That is today.

That was the first assumption, which proves conclusively, even though there is further proof, that time has already run out, and that there is need now for funds for necessary military construction and other military hardware.

But that is not all. Since that assumption was made, the time has not only passed, but the level of military operations upon which this \$1.7 billion calculation was based has doubled—even more than doubled—it has tripled.

So this problem is like being caught between two millstones. Congress is actually failing to perform a necessary function here in providing the needed authorization and money.

I repeat, the time has run out, and we have far more than doubled the military activity. That means we have more than doubled the rate at which money is spent and is needed. This now is a matter of necessity; there is no discretion left. These are the hard facts.

I think we have had enough discussion. The demands are such that I believe the leadership should exhaust every effort that they can, and we should all, by persuasion and any way possible, seek to bring this matter to a vote.

Things have been a little better down there in the fighting in the last few days. We are proud of that. But, basically and fundamentally, it is not any better. The need for these funds is just as great or even greater than it was a month or 60 days ago. The President has said as much, with all of his hopefulness, for some kind of peace negotiations or some kind of interlude. He said on Saturday that the fighting is going to be hard and it is going to be long. So I believe that the onus and the burden rests right here in the Senate. I believe that we have no choice left except to exhaust every possible effort to proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I wish to commend the Senator from Mississippi for that statement. From what has transpired here during the past 3 weeks, one would think that we were discussing whether it was wise to have any military intervention in Vietnam. The truth is, we are there. The question is: Are we going to support our men who are there under the U.S. flag? These men are not there of their own volition, but under orders from a higher authority.

Mr. President, I say that I hope the leadership will serve notice here tonight that we are coming in tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, and that the Senate will stay in session until it votes on the bill. I know of no other way to bring this matter to a conclusion. It may inconvenience Senators, but it will not kill them. The lives of some American boys in Vietnam could be lost if we keep shilly-shallying around here a great deal longer with this resolution. There are some items that are greatly in demand in Vietnam at this time. I believe that the leadership would be completely justified in serving notice that the Senate will come in tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, and that it will remain in session until it votes on the resolution.

We should vote the issue up or down. If Senators wish to kill it, let them say so, but do not leave our young men over 9,000 miles away from home, without the resources with which to defend them-

selves, without food, without adequate transportation, without medicine.

If the Senate is going to defeat the authorization, its Members should stand up forthrightly and do so.

I hope that the leadership will keep the Senate in session until it votes on the measure.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Georgia very much for his fine statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to add to what the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Georgia have just said. From this side of the aisle, we were unanimous in the Committee on Armed Services in reporting the bill promptly. While some of the Members did not fully agree, possibly, with the question of policy, they did agree with what the chairman of the committee has just stated, that this is a question of necessity for our boys who are serving under the leadership of our Commander in Chief over in Vietnam today.

I agree with everything the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Mississippi have said. I hope that we will pass this bill promptly.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his comments.

Mr. President, I should like to close with this statement, that this is the first time in the history of this country that the representatives of the people in Congress have stopped, right in the middle of a war—I repeat, stopped right in the middle of a war—and refused to pass necessary supporting legislation for men who have already been given their bayonets, men who are fighting on the battlefronts every day; but, instead, we argue as to how we got there, whether we should be there, and the policies surrounding the issue. The need for such debate has long since passed.

The need is now. The time for action is already here.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets on tomorrow, after the morning hour, debate be limited to 2 hours on each amendment, 1 hour for the sponsor of the amendment, and the remainder of the time for the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the Senator in charge of the bill; and that debate on the bill itself be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided between the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to include in the request that all amendments be germane, and I should now like to make the same motion for Wednesday.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is this a motion or unanimous consent?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets on Thursday, that debate be limited to 2 hours on each amendment, to be equally divided, 1 hour under the control of the Senator from Georgia, and 1 hour under the control of the sponsor of the amendment; and that debate on final passage be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided between the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Wait a minute—the minority leader has something to say on that—

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana does that mean—

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will please come to order.

The Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. BASS. Does that mean that we are going to dispose of this matter on Thursday and vote on final passage of this resolution one way or the other?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, it is possible that so many amendments could be offered that, allowing for 1 hour on each side, we might have to go on through Thursday, Friday, or even Saturday until we eventually come to a conclusion.

Mr. BASS. What about Tuesday and Wednesday, then?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Objection has already been heard on limiting debate tomorrow and Wednesday. I am now asking that we limit debate on Thursday in order that we might be sure to vote on this bill.

Mr. BASS. Let me say here that I do not see the need for continuing Tuesday or Wednesday, because I believe the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Mississippi have explained the situation very well. The business of delaying and filibustering—and it is a filibuster—whether we are an eagle, a hawk, or a dove, has gone on long enough. This resolution has been discussed all the way. Senators can stand up all night or all day, or all week, and say whether they agree with the position of this Nation or not, but we should come forward and vote—and we should do so now—on whether we are going to supply our men or not with what they need. If we are not going to do anything else, if we cannot get unanimous consent, then I suggest to my leader: Let us file a motion for cloture, and let the Senate get down to business. Let us take care of our fighting men.

The hawks and the doves have been flying all over. They have had the Senate floor. They have had television. They have had the whole country. Now it is time for the eagles to start taking over to see that our American men on the battlefronts in southeast Asia shall be provided with the necessary means. If we are not going to do that, we should get up a resolution which will draw the line as to whether we are going to get out or stay there.

I am not here to say whether we should start shooting or stop shooting. That is not my prerogative, or my business. I am here to say that I am getting sick and tired of seeing our American fighting men disregarded in the way that they are.

Twenty-one years ago, I was on the firing line myself. I would hate to think what would have happened to the over 2 million men who were serving in the European theater of operations with me at that time, if we had to sit down and worry about whether we were going to get enough bombs to fly a mission the next day, or whether we were going to get enough gasoline to fly a P-51 to escort a bombing mission over Nazi Germany. However, that is exactly what is going on at the present moment. It is almost a laughable situation, that a group of 100 grown men, elected by the people of the United States, cannot come to some decision as to whether our men, fighting for the welfare of this Nation and the freedom of the world—when we have the money to pay for the equipment, clothes, food, and comforts necessary for a man sacrificing his life—right or wrong—it was not his decision to be there—should be provided for.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, has the Senator been recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has recognized the—

Mr. PASTORE. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to associate myself with what has been said here this afternoon by the Senators from Georgia, Mississippi, and Tennessee. I think the time has come when we ought to get to a vote. This is the first time in the last 3 weeks we have had so many Senators on the floor, so I suggest respectfully that our acting leader inquire of the Senator from Oregon when we can expect to get to a vote on the proposed amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I will be glad to answer.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have been standing trying to get the floor to express my point of view. I want to say to the Senate that the senior Senator from Oregon has no intention at any time to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues in the Senate along the lines that I have heard made in the last 10 minutes in the Senate.

It is for each one of us to decide the reasons why he is following the course of action he is following. I would be quite less than human, of course, if I applauded the innuendoes in the speeches that have been made in the last 10 minutes. I only want to say most respectfully to my colleagues that I do not yield to a single one of them in my sense of loyalty to my Government and to the men in Vietnam.

There are quite a number of Senators I see in front of me who were in the East Room of the White House the other day, and I think, in view of the statements made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, I am violating no privilege if I point out that when a question was asked if at present there was any shortage for any of our men there, the Secretary of Defense replied in the negative.

Every one of you gentlemen in the Senate know I would not be supporting any procedure that denied our fighting men in South Vietnam anything they needed. But where we do not seem to join issue and where we do not seem to be looking together with respect to the bill is the question of policy involved in the bill. Many Senators have been assuring us that there is no question of policy involved.

As I said Friday—and it is in the RECORD if any Senator wishes to read it—this bill is pregnant with policy, and new policy. If the bill is adopted the Senate will be proceeding, in my judgment, to abdicate some great responsibility it owes to the people of this country. All I am saying is that we should consider the policy questions involved.

On the question of filibuster, there is no basis for this charge—

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I was the one who made the charge—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. How long does it take to discuss policy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Louisiana has yielded to me.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon, Does he propose to offer his amendment this afternoon on the pending bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I can get the floor in my own right, I shall be glad to answer the Senator's question, but I do not want to do it now in the position I have been placed in.

I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When I talked to the Senator from Alaska this afternoon, he said he was ready to offer his amendment. That amendment is printed. I discussed the matter with the Senator from Oregon at that time. At that time he indicated to me it would be either the amendment of the Senator from Alaska or his own amendment, although the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is not in print. I am simply asking for information whether the amendment will be offered this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. I will give that information, but I will give it in my own time, because it requires an explanation, in view of the position I have been placed in, and I have not placed myself in this position, in the last hour and a half. I want to be sure I am protected in my parliamentary rights, so I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask one more question. There are no other amendments printed. I am asking whether there will be other amendments offered—

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, there will be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am asking whether other amendments will be offered, so we can see how the business can be disposed of.

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, other amendments will be offered, but it is going to depend upon what happens when I get the floor to make a statement and what happens between now and 6 o'clock, when a group in the Senate expect to confer between now and 6 o'clock.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is there a unanimous consent in effect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is none.

Mr. MORSE. The Chair recognized my objection to the one for Thursday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I will yield the floor now until I get it in my own right.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me? I tried to get him to yield to me three times. If he does not wish to yield to me, it is all right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I wish to say again this is a vital piece of legislation. There has been debate but not on the merits of the pending legislation. No debate has been directed to the content of the pending legislation since the opening remarks were made in presenting the bill by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. Almost everything else pertaining to Vietnam has been discussed except the contents of the pending bill.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] stated that it contained some matters of policy. I read his remarks of last Friday.

Mr. President, the time has come when the Senate must take some action on the pending bill. We are making ourselves ridiculous by talking about everything except what the bill proposes to authorize.

Oh, I have been in filibusters, but I have never run one like this one. In filibusters where I participate, we discuss the merits of the question.

I believe the Senate should come in at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and stay in session and discuss the bill until we pass it. I might be the only one willing to do this, but I will be here tomorrow.

If a motion to adjourn is made, I shall try to get the yeas and nays on the question and see who wants to have a dila-

tory and desultory debate, while some men of the same blood as we are dying in Vietnam.

I shall ask the leadership to protect me if a unanimous-consent request is made. I cannot be here all the time. I am presiding over hearings on authorizations and appropriations for the fiscal year 1967.

I hope the leadership will protect me in my desire to determine whether Members of the Senate wish to continue to follow the procedure we have been following for the last 3 weeks. We should take some action one way or another.

If Senators want to vote down motions to adjourn and thereby to indicate that the bill should continue to hang here while the authorization is badly needed to support our efforts in Vietnam, let them do it. Let no Senator delude himself that this equipment is not badly needed in Vietnam. It is not only ammunition that is involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How does the Senator explain the provision in the House committee report which indicates that the pending bill does not provide for any acceleration of any badly needed goods, and might even properly have been included in the 1967 authorization?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not undertake to explain what was in the House committee report any more than I undertake to explain the position of the Senator from Arkansas on the pending legislation. I am not responsible for the House report any more than I am responsible for the position taken by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, I might say that the House Armed Services Committee is very sympathetic, I am told, to the needs of the armed services. The question is as to how badly supplies are needed and as to the urgency. The Armed Services Committee of the House stated that there was no particular urgency and that this bill is a kind of legerdemain affecting next year's budget. It was handled in this way so there would not be as big a deficit as would have been the case otherwise. Therefore these authorizations were shifted into this bill. As far as the material being needed now, the House stated that the testimony on that point was not persuasive.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Does the Senator from Arkansas undertake to explain the House language? What he has said sounds more like the Senator from Arkansas than the Senator from Georgia. The testimony before our committees indicated that this legislation is urgently needed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, I wish to say that there is a big difference between the testimony in the Senator's committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. Half of the testimony on the Senator's committee has been deleted. It does not mean a thing when anybody reads it. In my committee, we at least try to inform the people of the country what this is about.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator's committee did that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We did.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator had lengthy hearings and had the hearings televised, while our hearings were in executive session.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And most of the testimony in the hearings before the Senator's committee was deleted.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No, that is not correct. That statement is not correct. Most of it was not deleted. Less than 25 percent of it was deleted; only that part that was classified was deleted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not object to that. The Senator said that there is a big difference between the committees. There is a big difference between them. I am glad that the Foreign Relations Committee made every effort to tell the American people what this is all about.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not criticizing the Senator's committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator was criticizing us. It sounded like that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No, I am not criticizing the Senator's committee. I apologize if the Senator thought I was criticizing his committee.

Until the Senator referred to the Committee on Armed Services, I had not mentioned the Senator's committee or the Senator and I do not intend to do so at this time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wonder whether the Senator from Arkansas was talking about the bill before the Senate or the bill that is in his committee at the moment. There is a bill now before the Foreign Relations Committee. Perhaps the Senator was relying upon what the House committee said about the bill in the Foreign Relations Committee rather than the pending bill. That bill had a statement in it to the effect that it was of the utmost urgency and that unless we passed that bill many lives would be lost.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. For the moment I decline to be brought into any ring-around-the-rosy discussion on discussions in the House committee. I do not consider it appropriate in the first place, to discuss it here.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been supporting the position of the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senators from Mississippi, and Massachusetts, ever since this debate started, as appears from the colloquy, while the Senator from Georgia was making his first speech. I shall continue in that course until we pass this bill.

I believe that every time we get acrimonious in our discussions here on the floor, we are doing a very great disservice to our country. I wish to make it very clear that in a visit to my home State, which I know as a patriotic State, just

a few days ago, I found that this discussion here was causing confusion, was causing loss of morale in the minds of our people at home.

I wish all Senators could have heard the quotation from the Army textbook on morale in the armed services which was placed in the RECORD a little while ago by the Senator from South Carolina. Talking about men being hurt in Vietnam, talking about casualties there, I believe that confusion in our country and destruction of the morale of the homes whose sons are serving in the armed services of our country is as great a cause of loss of morale at the front as could possibly be occasioned by a great step-up in the casualties in Vietnam.

I hope that we may bring this debate to a halt even by filing a cloture motion if that is necessary. I am not very strong for cloture. I am strong for lengthy debate, as Senators know. But I think that every ordinary and reasonable limit has been exceeded in this debate and I would vote for cloture.

I hope that the leaders of this debate will insist on cloture or get some agreement, formal or informal, to bring this to a close.

I think we are sapping the morale of the men in Vietnam and sapping the morale of their families at home by this long discussion. If Senators do not think that that is so talk to the people at home whose boys are in the service. They will tell you that their morale is being strained and grievously hurt by this discussion. I hope that this debate will be brought to an early conclusion.

I completely support the consistent request of the Senator from Georgia that we come in tomorrow and see this matter through. We can see it through. We should see it through. It will be in the interest of the country if we do see it through tomorrow, if it takes an all-night session or however long it takes.

Let us get done with this matter and assure not only our men over there, fighting and in danger, some of whom may die, but also assure their families, friends, and communities that there is not a great division in the Senate on the subject of prompt supply of the things that they need. That is what is involved in this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct. This discussion cannot possibly help the country. It cannot establish policy. It cannot help anything except our enemies. This is not a policymaking bill.

It is unusual for members of one committee to hold up legislation reported from another committee so that they can have televised hearings to present the question before the country.

I saw a great deal of the televised hearings and I did not hear anything that detracted from the need for the pending bill.

Questions were asked about everything else, but Senators did not ask Mr. Kennan and General Gavin whether the authorization in the pending bill is needed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean the pending bill?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes; I meant the pending business before the Senate. I am talking about the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Some members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are holding this matter up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are not holding this matter up.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Is the Senator ready to vote?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The committee has taken no action on this bill now before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Some members of the committee have been holding it up. The Senator from Arkansas is here defending his action. He is criticizing the Armed Services Committee for its statement that the legislation is necessary. We have the amazing spectacle of one major committee delaying action or filibustering, or whatever one might call it, on the floor of the Senate so that they can conduct televised hearings on the same subject that another committee has reported legislation on.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I had promised to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am on record for hoping we would get to a vote as soon as possible.

I trust the distinguished Senator from Florida, in talking about the nature of this debate, was not criticizing the senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HOLLAND. That was not in my mind at all.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to hear it.

I have been on the Armed Services Committee with the Senator from Georgia for some 14 years, and before that testified before him for some 7 years.

My opinion is shared by everyone on both sides of the aisle; namely, that no one in the Senate is more courteous when it comes to people stating their position, either in committee, or on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I hope the Senator from Georgia accepts the assurance of the Senator from North Carolina that the Senator from North Carolina heard all of the testimony presented before the Committee on Armed Services, both that which was printed and that which was deleted as classified, and that that testimony left in the mind of the Senator from North Carolina an abiding impression and an abiding conviction that the speedy passage of this bill is necessary to furnish weapons to our boys in South Vietnam who are being attacked at this moment by the enemy.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The talk about this being relevant to the present needs of the men in Vietnam is clearly contravened

by the statement of the Vice President at the meeting at the White House. When the Vice President was asked by a Member of the House: "Mr. Vice President, while you were in Vietnam, did you find any shortage of any essential material at the present time?"

The Vice President responded, approximately in these words: he said he had asked General Westmoreland and the general assured him that there was no shortage of any essential material necessary for the prosecution of the war at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Does the Senator intend to continue this debate until there is a shortage?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. How long does the Senator think we can delay?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The only time I have spoken on this bill has been in this exchange. I do not know why the Senator accuses me.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is defending the delay.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think debate is perfectly proper, because there is no urgency. It is quite clear there is none. In addition to the statement by the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, as I recall, made a similar reply. He said that this bill, as the House committee report itself states, is not designed to supply any present, current deficiencies in supplies in Vietnam; it is for a long-range procurement, except for one item. According to the Senator from Georgia, the only item which is to be put under contract in the relatively near future would be helicopters. But most of the bill is to provide over a long period of time for a major buildup or enlargement of bases, and so on. That is set forth in the report of the Senator's own committee. I need not read that.

I have not been delaying action on the bill. The Committee on Foreign Relations takes no position on this bill and is not responsible for any discussion that members of the committee have conducted personally. I have not yet said anything that I would like to have an opportunity to say.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Arkansas is springing to the defense of his committee before it is attacked.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the 21 years that I have been a Member of the Senate, I have never seen the Senator from Georgia so anxious about stopping debate. He and I used to say that the Senate was the place to continue deliberations; that the Senate was ideally and uniquely fitted for the discussion of important subjects. I do not understand the Senator's sudden change. Why should we not have a few hours each in which to discuss this subject? I can remember when the Senator from Georgia and I used to take weeks to debate matters, matters which may not have been equally important, I will admit; but he never before took the view that the subject was so urgent that it had to be voted on immediately, without full discussion.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I have said time and again in the Senate that

I have participated in filibusters. I have also said that I would never vote for cloture unless the national security was involved. I feel so strongly that the national security is involved in this matter that I have about come to the conclusion that I could vote for cloture on this particular bill.

The Senator from Arkansas may console himself with the report of the House committee. He consoles himself with the thought that there is no GI or no marine who has to run because he does not have any ammunition. But a terrible situation exists in Vietnam. The conditions of logistics there constitute one of the gravest problems this country has ever had. Ships have been waiting week after week to be unloaded. We do not have the proper storage facilities there. It is difficult to find the things the men need.

A number of items that are not on order should be on order today. The assembly lines should be operating to turn them out, so that they can be sent to Vietnam.

If the Senator from Arkansas wishes to discuss this question further, he has in his committee a bill that deals with Vietnam. Let him bring it to the floor of the Senate. Let the members of his committee discuss it to their heart's content. But I do not think this bill should be held up any longer.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arkansas said that there is no vital need to pass the bill at this time, a bill that provides for the supplies that are needed in Vietnam. I invite the Senator's attention to page 2 of the Senate committee report. I shall read two lines:

The August addition was insufficient to finance the higher production rates beyond February 1966.

That is now.

The procurement authorization of \$3,417,700,000 contained in this bill is the part of the additional \$7 billion requested for procurement in fiscal year 1966 that requires new authorization.

I also invite the attention of the Senate to page 46 of the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, in which the Secretary of Defense replied to a question asked by me. The question and answer are as follows:

Senator SALTONSTALL. So that fundamentally, you are increasing the 1966 budget through supplemental appropriations to keep your 1967 budget down?

Senator McNAMARA. No, sir; not to keep the 1967 budget down but to keep the military operations continuing in South Vietnam in fiscal 1967. We haven't put a dollar in 1966 that could be put in 1967 while still supporting the operations in southeast Asia. Because the operations in the future are so uncertain we want to fund them at the last possible moment and that has been the basic policy underlying both the 1966 supplemental and the 1967 budget, which means that we haven't pushed anything into 1966 that we think we could obtain delivery on if funded in 1967.

That is why the Committee on Armed Services unanimously reported the bill,

regardless of whether we agreed with all the policymaking concerning Vietnam. The money is needed now to support our men and to provide them with the proper materiel—ammunition, helicopters, bombs, and all that goes with conducting the operations in South Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. And to see that it reaches them. It is not enough to have the materiel; it is necessary to provide the facilities which will enable the materiel to reach its destination. It has taken 2 months before some ships could be unloaded. If any Senators are left who are interested in Government expenditures, I point out that every day a ship lays over, every seaman draws \$14 a day in addition to his regular pay, because he is said to be in a war zone. The master, too, receives additional pay. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are being paid out because sufficient facilities are not available to unload ships.

Many of the items in the bill are construction items that are of vital importance. They are needed to provide an uninterrupted supply of equipment.

I urge the majority leader again—and also the distinguished minority leader; I know how much opposed he is to lengthy sessions—

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am ready.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. To have the Senate, after it convenes tomorrow, to remain in session until the bill is disposed of.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I stand behind the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Mississippi, and the Senator from Massachusetts in urging the immediate passage of the bill. This is a vital bill. The leadership provided an opportunity on Saturday for those who claimed they wanted time to speak, but they would not come to speak. We understand the issues. Any further speeches will be for the purpose of delay.

It will not take more than one or two nights to conclude action on the bill. I think we can finish this debate, and we ought to do it. I support the position of the Senator from Georgia. I hope the leadership, when it calls us into session tomorrow, will have us remain in session until action on the bill is concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to speak briefly to the Senate in response to what the esteemed Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said concerning what the Vice President reported at the White House. The Senator from Arkansas questioned the incident with respect to the conversation with General Westmoreland, and General Westmoreland stating that his materiel was not in short supply, generally, with respect to ammunition. This received a general answer. Here is the specific situation, as reflected by the testimony of General Wheeler a few days ago, which expressly explains the particular situation with reference to the 2.75-inch rocket, which

is now highly effective. It is a small rocket that has been used particularly from helicopters to clear a way in advance for a landing and then to protect the perimeter, to allow the boys to land. A large supply of these rockets is needed. We have received letters from the boys out there saying, "Send us more of the 2.75-inch rockets." The Department of Defense will be quite willing to admit that there is any kind of shortage; but here is the specific testimony of Secretary McNamara with reference to the 2.75-inch rockets.

Mr. KUCHEL. From what page of the hearings is the Senator reading?

Mr. STENNIS. I read from page 211 of the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services:

However, in the last year or two, we have experimented with the use of 2.75-inch rockets for use against personnel when fired from helicopters, and this is a new use and requires a different head, a fragmentation head.

The expansion of our helicopter force in South Vietnam and the arming of that force with this rocket has so sharply expanded our requirements for it that its supply has been tight.

That is the testimony of the Secretary of Defense, who says the supply has been tight.

The Subcommittee on Preparedness has an abundance of testimony—volumes of testimony—about the need for more of these rockets.

General Wheeler then said in response to a question from Senator BYRD of West Virginia:

General Westmoreland has applied out there what is called an available supply rate for the 2.75's. I believe I have some information regarding the subject.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. The accuracy of our report that this money is needed now has been challenged on the floor.

General Wheeler said:

General Westmoreland has applied out there what is called an available supply rate for the 2.75's. I believe I have some information regarding this subject.

By "out there" General Wheeler was referring to Vietnam. The available supply rate means in battle terms, as all committee members understand, that there is a limitation. The supply rate is on a day-to-day basis, based not on what might be needed, but on what is available. That is the meaning of the term.

We have been able to keep them going and there has been no acute shortage. However, the boys flying the helicopters and getting shot at, and the men at the guns in the helicopters—and I have talked to wounded men at Walter Reed Hospital, and I have letters from many of them—say that the available supply rate is not enough.

General Wheeler said:

I believe I have some information regarding this subject.

On page 212 of the hearings, General Wheeler said:

I have that information now.

That information pertains to the 2.75's, and the tight supply and the daily available supply, and the rest of his answer is deleted. Why is it deleted? It is deleted because a full answer in print would be giving information from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the enemy.

There is only a daily available supply for these men.

We have said from the beginning that the money in the bill is to supply this materiel.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the very able chairman of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee. His subcommittee has done a great deal more work than any other committee in the Senate in an effort to discover the facts about shortages in Vietnam.

Mr. President, anyone with industrial experience knows that when one goes from tens of thousands of units or people to hundreds of thousands within a relatively few months, there are bound to be shortages, whether in a plant, or in a military department.

The bill before us involves an effort to overcome such shortages. We hear about Cam Ranh Bay, and the tremendous new port being developed there.

There was but one modern dock and one obsolete dock at Cam Ranh Bay less than 60 days ago.

This bill would help supply the needs which exist to supply the troops. When there is a shortage of ammunition, that ammunition can be "red balled" over by airplane. But, we cannot "red ball" tractors, or any heavy construction equipment.

Two months ago there were some 80 ships waiting to be unloaded because of a lack of adequate dock facilities. It is absurd on the face of it to have anyone say that under such an expansion it could be done without some shortages.

Anytime there is comparable augmentation, in any part of our economy, military or otherwise, to the extent there has been in South Vietnam, there are bound to be shortages.

The purpose of the bill is to overcome such shortages, as the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has so well presented this afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is it in order to read from a report of a committee of the House of Representatives?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reads from page 314 of "Senate Procedure":

Under the precedents it has been held not in order in debate for a Senator to make reference to action by the House of Representatives, to read an extract from the proceedings of the House relating to a matter under discussion, to read from a speech made by a Member of the House during that particular Congress on the pending subject, to refer to or make any illusion to or comment upon the proceedings of the House of

Representatives, or to make reference to the proceedings in the House on the matter under consideration for the purpose of influencing the action of the Senate.

It is out of order, as interfering with the independence of the two Houses, to allude to what has been done in the other House as a means of influencing the judgment of the one in which a question is pending.

However, if no objection is interposed, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas be permitted to read the report of any House committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, it is a new wrinkle to have the Senate run over to get support from the House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, under the practice of the Foreign Relations Committee, we always receive reports from the other body and consider reports on bills that come to our committee. We take note of them. We accept the bills and notice the amendments the House has added to the bills.

I did not know that we were so insulated from the other body. All I want to do is to complete the RECORD and give at least some basis for my view.

I read from page 3 of the report of the House Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

If there is one reservation felt by many members of the committee regarding the necessity for this legislation, it arises from the possibility that many of the items involved, in all three categories of procurement, research and development, and construction, may simply have been moved from the regular 1967 authorization to the supplemental 1966 authorization without any real program for acceleration. Obviously no military advantages would be gained by such a book-keeping situation.

Mr. President, I submit that this is a very straightforward statement.

This is the committee report, issued after full hearings. I assume that they have just as full hearings as do Senate committees. It is their belief that there is no urgency about this matter, that it would be normally carried in the 1967 budget except that it is the desire of the administration to minimize the deficit in next year's budget, and throw it into this year's budget.

That is quite obvious. That is what that statement means to me. Of course, if we were to ask the Secretary of Defense point blank: "Do you mean to say that you are up here trying to horn-swoggle this country and keep next year's budget in better shape?" he would say: "No. We need it."

This is the deliberate and considered judgment of the committee, issued in the formal report of the House committee. That is at least sufficient to raise a question as to the urgency of the matter.

I do not deny that the Senator from Georgia has a right to have exactly the opposite view. However, I think that he will admit that this raises a question which deserves some consideration and gives cause to wonder whether there is

sufficient urgency to warrant forcing this bill through under high pressure.

That is all we are saying. I am not trying to delay the measure. I have not taken any time on this measure except for a few moments this afternoon by way of interogatory.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, there certainly are strong reasons to get the bill through. The measure has been here on the floor for almost 3 weeks. I cannot say that there are efforts to cram something down somebody's throat.

I have not read that report. However, I do not understand that the Senator has read anything from the report that stated this was an effort to evade anything.

It was stated that it is entirely possible that some items could go over to the 1967 appropriation bill. I have no quarrel with that statement. There may be some items that could safely be deferred to the 1967 appropriation bill. However, I do not believe the Senate should be willing to take chances when over 300,000 of our boys are in Vietnam and contiguous areas.

We have had this bill in the Senate for nearly 3 weeks. Nobody has tried to cram it down anybody's throat. We have given everybody a chance to speak. We begged them to come in and speak. But now we are begging them to vote.

I say there is nothing in that committee report that will justify a statement that the bill is not needed and is not urgent. The House report intimated it is possible that some items could be carried over until the regular authorization for fiscal year 1967; and, of course, when there are so many items involved, that statement undoubtedly is true.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, and yield to me later.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to talk myself sometime.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I speak for 1 minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I simply add to what the Senator from Georgia has said. Under section 612 of the statutes, there are certain things that can be carried over beyond the appropriation amount, such as food, clothing, and that type of thing; but not procurement, not ammunition, not construction of wharves, not airfields, nor runways, nor roads necessary for us to carry on our operations in Vietnam. Those items are provided for in this bill, and that is why the appropriation is so necessary.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For clarification of the RECORD, there has been a great deal said about the Senate relating to this

bill; and when we say the "Senate," our friends report it that way.

All of us are not going to speak on the matter, as that would delay it longer; but I think the RECORD should be clear that the vast majority of the Senators wish to vote on this bill now, wished to vote on it last week, and wish to proceed with the Senate's business. That majority includes the Senator from Washington. So I hope the Senate will not be chastised or the word go out that the Senate is delaying this bill. Because when the Senate is mentioned, in some places they say, "Oh, yes, that Senator of ours." You know?

I am ready to vote. I was ready last week. I was ready even the first of the week, and I think the quicker we get it done, the better.

So I hope my friends in the Press Gallery will do us justice in the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Did the Senator from Arkansas insert all of the portion of the House report under the heading "Committee Reservation," or just the part that he read?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I just read a part. I did not put it all in.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three paragraphs under the heading "Committee Reservation" in House Report No. 1293 be printed at this point in the RECORD, because it states this legislation is approved by the committee in order to achieve more rapid replacement of articles consumed, and to provide proper equipment for a larger force in a shorter period of time. That is exactly what we are recommending here.

There being no objection, the excerpt from House Report No. 1293 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE RESERVATIONS

The essential purpose of, and underlying cause for, the proposed legislation is, of course, the war in Vietnam. Aircraft, both fixed wing and helicopters, ships, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles are all being utilized at a rate greater than it was possible to anticipate when the 1966 authorization for those items was passed. This legislation was approved by the committee solely in order to achieve more rapid procurement of replacements of articles consumed, and to provide proper equipment for a larger force in a shorter period of time.

If there is one reservation felt by many members of the committee regarding the necessity for this legislation, it arises from the possibility that many of the items involved, in all three categories of procurement, research and development, and construction, may simply have been moved from the regular 1967 authorization to this supplemental 1966 authorization without any real program for acceleration. Obviously no military advantages would be gained by such a bookkeeping situation. Testimony on this subject was indecisive and the committee has not yet been provided with sufficient definitive data to pinpoint the exact degree of real acceleration, or to determine the amounts involved in the proposed legislation which could safely and should properly be deferred until the regular 1967 authorization.

We realize the difficulty of determining exact future needs in any wartime framework, however, and to the extent of the pro-

posed legislation we are accepting in good faith the assurances of the services and the Department of Defense that this authority is needed for these purposes at this time. We assure the Members of the House that the performance of the Department of Defense and of the services in living up to these assurances will be closely followed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a reading of the RECORD indicated as recently as last Friday that there would be opposition to any unanimous-consent requests which would be offered during consideration of the pending measure. I believe that in view of what has happened today, as well as the statement of last Friday, we should recognize the fact that it would be impossible at this time to achieve a unanimous-consent agreement seeking to bring about an end to debate.

I would hope, therefore, that the Senate would be understanding enough to realize that even though it is impossible at this time to achieve unanimous consent to limit debate, the debate still may not be excessively long, and we may be able to come to a vote perhaps some time during the present week. As a matter of fact, I believe that the leader of the opposition to parts of this bill stated on last Friday that it was his impression and belief that it might be possible to arrive at a vote on Tuesday of this week. Time will tell.

As far as my position is concerned, it is my intention, at present, to vote against all amendments to the pending measure. I think the proposal is important in itself and I think, in view of the information brought out by the members of the Armed Services Committee, that its importance is recognized. I personally would take cognizance of what the Senate committee has reported, rather than a committee of the other body.

Insofar as cloture is concerned, it is not my intention to offer a motion for cloture, because I think that, too, might delay things beyond a reasonable length of time. Certainly on the basis of less than 2 weeks' consideration of the pending bill, I see no need for a cloture motion at the moment.

Insofar as the question of logistics is concerned, there are shortages in Vietnam, and this bill will help to make up those shortages. I recall, for example, when the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] was in Vietnam in November, he visited the headquarters of the 1st Cavalry, and if my memory serves me correctly, he learned that 59 percent of the helicopters were incapacitated because of lack of spare parts. That, of course, has been corrected since that time.

The distinguished chairman of the committee has brought out the fact that there is a logistical problem in Vietnam. There was and there is. Ships have lined up for miles out into the South China Sea. Some of them have become so low on fuel and food that they had to leave the line, go back to the Philippines to store up fuel and food to get going again, and come back and get in line. There are plenty of shortages

which must be corrected out there. Regardless of anyone's position on what is going on in Vietnam, it would be my hope and it is my belief that if we operate in an orderly manner, if we keep our shirts on, if we avoid, for the time being, all talk of cloture and all-night sessions, in the long run we will be ahead.

Tomorrow the Senate meets at 11 o'clock. We will stay in session a little later. There is no objection to that kind of procedure. But there will not be all-night sessions; and as far as I am concerned, I do not intend to lay down a motion for cloture. I make this statement on the basis of deep consideration of the fact—at least I think it is a fact—that if we operate in that fashion, we will be able to bring this matter to a decisive vote sooner. And I should note, finally, that as far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, he is in favor of this bill 100 percent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, now that I have the floor in my own right, I wish to make a few observations before discussing my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion this afternoon about the views of many of my fellow Senators that we should have immediate action on this bill, before there has been a full debate on the merits of various issues involved in the bill.

No one has yet pointed out that the bill has not passed the House. This bill still has to be voted on in the House, and frankly, I am at a loss to understand why there is this terrific drive on in connection with this bill in the Senate, to shut off debate on issues that many of us have been raising in good faith. I have said and repeat, if I ever have the slightest idea that a filibuster has started on this bill, I will try to be the first to sign a cloture motion.

Mr. President, in my judgment—and I speak respectfully—it is grossly unfair for anyone to charge that any of us who have been discussing this bill has been engaged in a filibuster. Read our speeches.

Various discussions have taken place in the Senate while this bill has been pending. If those who have been talking about what I consider to be entirely irrelevant procedural matters connected with our debate had not eaten up the time with those hours we would be much further along in the consideration of the merits of this bill, and toward the completion of our discussion of its merits.

Those of us opposing the bill in its present form have not been filibustering it. We have been raising questions. We have been presenting evidence. We have been pointing out what we consider to be some of the serious defects in the bill.

I intend to point out a few more this afternoon.

Let me say for the benefit of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator

from Illinois that reference was made by the majority leader a few moments ago to the fact that we had discussions last week, when there was talk about trying to get a unanimous-consent agreement, and I said that I was not going to give unanimous consent at any time in connection with the bill.

I said then I was hopeful that if debate followed its regular course, we could be through with the bill tomorrow night. I also said that I hoped we could be through with the bill by last Friday night. It was my hope—I wish to repeat what I have just said—that after all, there were a great many interruptions in this debate from the standpoint of debate on the merits of the bill and because of certain parliamentary strategic matters and certain procedural matters. But, let the RECORD speak for itself; I made clear in all those discussions that that was what I hoped for, and that I would work to that end; but, also, I could not guarantee when debate on the bill as to its merits would finish. It was a question that the leadership of the Senate received from the Senator from Oregon, his statement of good faith, and I made the statement of good faith, and I stand by it.

I have done nothing to prevent the consideration of the bill on its merits, but I am disappointed that all the discussion has not been on the merits of the bill, but has been on what I consider to be extraneous, irrelevant procedural matters.

I had hoped to get an amendment before this body much earlier today, but let the RECORD say why I have not. As I said to the minority leader who came over to my desk a few minutes ago, I said to him that last week I hoped to get an amendment up and planned to get the amendment up today. I still hope to get the amendment up before we adjourn, if we do not adjourn too early.

Why have I not brought it in? Why am I not going to put one in, in the course of this speech? It is because I believe in teamwork in the Senate, that is why.

Earlier today, a group of Senators came to me and asked me not to put in an amendment until they could have a 3 o'clock conference. They had the 3 o'clock conference, and I was there part of the time. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] agreed to give me full protection until 4 o'clock, so far as my procedural rights were concerned, so that I could go to the meeting. I was invited to go to the meeting. I went to the meeting.

It is not for me to disclose what took place at the meeting other than to say that there was a discussion as to what the position of some Members of the Senate should be, or might be, in regard to any possible amendments to the bill. They felt that if I introduced an amendment prior to the reaching of a consensus of opinion among them as to what their position might be, I might make it more difficult for them. That is all they had to say to me. They could count on me not to introduce an amendment until they had completed their discussions.

I was at that meeting when the quorum bell rang. I said to the group, "I have no recourse but to go to the floor of the

Senate in accordance with my understanding with the Senator from Louisiana and in all fairness to him, but I am perfectly willing to tell you what I said. I will take the floor, and I will discuss the matter and offer no amendment until you give me some advice as to what conclusions, if any, you have reached."

I came up here to do that. The first man I went to was the Senator from Louisiana, and I told him just what I said on the floor of the Senate, that this was the situation in which I found myself because the Senator from Louisiana said to me at least two times, "When are you going to introduce your amendment?" I said, "I am not in a position to introduce it yet because of the procedural situation that is developing."

So I came to the floor of the Senate and reported to the Senator from Louisiana that I was not going to be in a position to introduce my amendment until the meeting downstairs had decided on a consensus of opinion, if they had a consensus.

Then the live quorum was called, and that meeting necessarily had to break up. I was sitting here in my seat when two representatives of the meeting came to me and said, "WAYNE, we are going to go back in session at 5:15 and we sincerely hope that you will not introduce any amendment until we complete the next conference because we did not have adequate time to reach a consensus."

I said to them, "I want the Senate to know that I will not introduce an amendment, but I have a good many things to say in regard to the merits of the bill. I will not introduce my amendment until you advise me as to what action you were able to reach in regard to the conference."

Ordinarily, I do not say these things on the floor of the Senate, but, in effect, some of the things which have been implied in regard to me I wish the record of this debate to show why I have followed the procedural course of action which I have followed.

I propose now to proceed to discuss some of the items that I indicated last Friday I would discuss again today.

I wish, in my first point on the substance of the bill, to say that this is a policy bill, that this is not just an authorization bill for funds, but that this is an authorization bill for many major changes in foreign policy of the Government of the United States vis-a-vis southeast Asia.

If we pass the authorization bill, we will be authorizing the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense to follow a whole series of new policies in respect to the war in southeast Asia. We should decide whether we wish to adopt that policy. For, if we authorize the provisions of the bill, in my judgment, we will be turning over to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Defense power which no President, no Secretary of Defense, should ever be given by Congress. We will be turning that power over, in respect to new policies, without retaining a check on the part of Congress. To me, that is of great importance to decide, before we come to a vote on the bill.

Mr. President, it pains me to express such great differences of opinion with my President but, in my judgment, he has announced an intention to follow a policy in the conduct of the war in southeast Asia which, in my judgment, unless we check him—and by that I mean unless we stop him—we will be on our way to an escalated war in Asia.

Of course, we have honest differences of opinion between and among us as to whether that will be the result. But it is because I am so deeply convinced that that result is inevitable that I have followed the course of action I have followed in regard to the war in southeast Asia.

I am perfectly willing to stand on that record, but let me say to the Senate this afternoon that we cannot put our heads in the political sands and come to a conclusion that the people are with us, for I am satisfied that the President of the United States is losing American public opinion by the millions of individuals week by week.

In my judgment, the friends of the President of the United States are not those who are fighting to give him this new policy under the bill. In my judgment, the votes for the new policy provided for in this bill are not, in terms of history, going to be a kindly and friendly act toward the President of the United States. History is going to prove that such votes in the adoption of such a policy are going to do great damage to the President of the United States.

The President of the United States needs to be checked in the proposals that are encompassed in this bill and from exercising the executive authority that the bill would give to him.

We saw the poll in today's papers. I do not know how accurate it is, but it is not on the basis of polls that I go. I do not think one can go into any region of the United States at the present time and not find increasing numbers of Americans who are expressing disapproval of the escalating policies of the President of the United States in the conduct of this executive war.

We, the Congress, must assume our responsibility for much of it. In my judgment, the Congress made a most unfortunate mistake in August 1964, when, undoubtedly at the request of the Chief Executive and the executive branch of the Government, Congress passed the ill-fated resolution of August 1964, proposing to give to the President of the United States the authority that the resolution gave him to prosecute, in accordance with his decisions, an executive war.

That was a great mistake, and I am going to talk about it momentarily. But what we gave him we can take away, and the resolution contained a rescission clause. The senior Senator from Oregon has been saying that he thinks the rescission clause should be up for a vote in the Senate.

I do not have to tell anyone what the argument is against offering a rescission clause.

Most Senators will vote either against the rescission clause or for a substitute resolution reaffirming the position that they took in August 1964—as though

that were an argument why the senior Senator from Oregon should not offer his amendment.

I want to continue to believe we have a government by the people in this Republic, and not a government that stops with the Congress of the United States or with the White House.

It is still true that, after all, the residue of power rests in the people of this country; and the people of this country are entitled to know where their elected representatives stand in regard to an expansion and acceleration of this war. And the pending bill provides for an acceleration and expansion of the war. Oh, I know it can be said, that is true only if the President decides to use the power this authorization bill gives him to build more bases in southeast Asia and to finance a war effort for any other nation that sends in troops. I speak respectfully when I say the President has made perfectly clear he will use such power, on the basis of the power he has already used—far in excess of the power any President of the United States should use.

I have no doubt what the President will do if Congress passes this bill. I am not at all moved by the semantics he used in New York City the other night. I shall have something to say about that speech, too, before I finish.

We have just read in the last 24 hours or so in the press of the United States a statement by the President to the effect that he did not need any resolution to carry on his Executive power in connection with the prosecution of this war.

Mr. President, I do not scare easily, but that statement of the President of the United States frightens me, because it is the statement of a man who is saying, in effect, to the American people that he intends to do what he wants to do on the basis of his assumption that he has the Executive power to prosecute this war in accordance with his policy.

All I want to say to the American people is, "Take the power away from him just as fast as you can take it away." If the Congress of the United States does not want to check this President, then I say from the floor of the Senate today, the people must check him if we are to avoid the danger of a massive war in Asia.

So the senior Senator from Oregon is placed in a position where, in the next few hours, depending upon what the conference group to which I have already alluded may decide by way of a different suggestion that the amendment the senior Senator from Oregon may offer, I shall offer one of two amendments I have unless this conference group can come forward with a suggested substitute which in my judgment would be preferable to either one of the amendments that would be offered by the Senator from Oregon.

I stress again that the abiding concern of the senior Senator from Oregon in regard to the pending legislation in the Senate, which has yet to pass the House of Representatives, is that this legislation will underwrite and authorize the exercise of power on the part of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense that neither of

these men should be given if we are to preserve a workable system of checks and balances in our form of government.

If I offered my so-called rescission amendment, I want to point out that rescission by concurrent resolution which I offered on January 29 is not possible as an amendment to this legislation.

I would that time had permitted the Foreign Relations Committee to hold hearings on my rescission concurrent resolution. I think that would have been preferable. Time has not permitted it. When I talk about the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee, let me say I thought it was very disappointing in the debate this afternoon to hear the comments that were made, in reflection on the great work of the Foreign Relations Committee under the leadership of that great statesman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Those public hearings should continue. It is immaterial to me whether they continue in the same format in which they were conducted, but the American people are entitled to know in public hearings what our foreign policy is or is going to be.

We have not called before the Foreign Relations Committee yet a single authority on China. I am at a loss to understand how anyone who wishes to pass the authorization bill before us, which is an authorization for foreign policy, would want to do so without having a public record as to what the China experts think. What is to be expected from China when we further escalate the war under this bill? Does anyone know what China might do? Or North Vietnam?

It may very well be the difference of this bill. It may very well be the difference of the Senate bill which is pending before the Foreign Relations Committee. It may be the difference of the various proposals that are being advanced these days for an escalated and expanded war in Asia.

We ought to know before we authorize the policy. If there is a policy authorized there is not very much chance of getting it deauthorized. Senators are making the decisions as to the nature of the war that will be prosecuted in southeast Asia on this bill.

I certainly do not question the dedicated loyalty and patriotism of everyone on the other side of this issue. But I do not yield to them one iota in respect to my own dedication and my own loyalty. We have honest differences of opinion as to how to best protect those boys in southeast Asia. The policy I would follow is a policy that would stop killing them. The policy the majority is advocating is a policy that will kill increasing numbers of them.

The policy that I am advocating is one that leads to a stopping of the United States conducting, for the most part, a unilateral war in southeast Asia, which we had no right to start and we have no right to maintain.

Here is a Senator who is still waiting for an answer to the policies of a General Gavin and a former Ambassador George Kennan. In my judgment this administration has not, up to this time rebutted the proposals of a General

Gavin or the proposals of a former Ambassador Kennan.

Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, over the weekend I have been asked by a good many of my constituents and members of the press whether there was any substantial difference between the President of the United States and me with respect to our attitudes toward Vietnam.

I have said that if the President—and I think that this is a fair statement—stands by the statements made on his behalf by his press secretary, Mr. Bill Moyers, and I have no reason to think he does not; and if the President stands by the first 9 points in his 10 point statement in his New York speech, and I have no reason to think that he will not—in fact, I believe that he will—and if the President believes that there is no substantial difference, or more accurately that he has no quarrel with the point of view expressed before the Foreign Relations Committee by General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan, then, as far as I am concerned the President of the United States and I are in accord.

But one hears disturbing stories and one reads disturbing stories in the press in which others are quoted as indicating that the President's real point of view is very different from that which I have just outlined.

I was on the west coast over the weekend and I was disturbed to read an article in the San Francisco Chronicle originally printed on Saturday, February 26, in the New York Times under the byline of Seymour Topping. The Chronicle carries the New York Times service. The article is entitled "United States and Vietnam Draw War Plans for 3 to 7 Years."

There are some statements in that article I would like to read into the Record. Then, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. These excerpts disturb me very much. This comes from Saigon and it purports to quote high senior United States and South Vietnamese officials. One would assume that whoever spoke, spoke with the authority of Ambassador Lodge, General Westmoreland, and Marshall Ky. I quote as follows:

Under the new plans—

Said to have been on the way to being carried out by South Vietnamese and American officials in Saigon—

the level of offensive operations is to be raised as the support capability of U.S. forces is expanded through the improvement of port facilities at Saigon and other harbors extending north to Da Nang. Additional troops are to be brought to Vietnam so that the military commanders will have sufficient forces to strike hard at Vietcong base areas. Air strikes at communication lines in North Vietnam and infiltration routes through Laos are to be continued. U.S. troops will be permitted to enter Cambodia in pursuit of Vietcong forces and North Vietnamese units that are reported to be based there.

Further on, there is the following quotation:

[Gen. William C. Westmoreland] intends to employ U.S. troops, which now number more than 200,000, in a series of sweeps directed at destroying, defeating, or neutralizing the Vietcong's main force units, which are estimated to total 80,000 men.

Despite private assurances from President Johnson—

I repeat that—

Despite private assurances from President Johnson that the administration will prosecute the war as is required, officials in Saigon are wondering whether the American people will tolerate the casualties that are foreseen in the projected military operations. During periods of maximum combat effort, it is expected that American casualties each month will average about 400 to 500 dead and about 15,000 wounded.

Since the Honolulu Conference the key U.S. officials here * * * have been given a clear mandate to put the program into effect. A number of policy options have been discarded.

Official planning in Saigon no longer takes account of any possibility of peace negotiations within the Vietcong.

The President is said now to be bent on action to break the back of the Communist-led insurgency.

Quoting again:

The mining of the channel to the port of Haiphong and the destruction of jet airfields near Hanoi are still under consideration.

General Westmoreland believes that it will take several years to break the Vietcong main force units.

Quoting again:

Vietcong losses, in killed and wounded, are being made up by the infiltration of troops from North Vietnam, now estimated to total 4,500 a month, and the drafting of men in South Vietnam.

Quoting again:

At no stage in the political and military program do American or Vietnamese officials in Saigon foresee an opening of negotiations with the Vietcong toward a peace settlement.

Quoting again:

Even the most optimistic officials are uneasy about returning to Honolulu next June to meet President Johnson's demand for a demonstration of how many coonskins have been nailed to the wall.

Then the final quotation:

No responsible United States or Vietnamese official in Saigon expects to record spectacular gains by as early as next June. One South Vietnamese official wryly said he might have to skin his stuffed tiger to have something to show to the President in Honolulu.

If that report from Saigon, by a thoroughly reputable and experienced reporter, properly represents the policy of the United States, agreed to by the President, I say with deep regret and the utmost respect that I am strongly opposed to that policy and that, in my judgment, so are the people of the United States.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding to me.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES AND VIETNAM DRAW WAR PLANS FOR 3 TO 7 YEARS: OFFICIALS IN SAIGON CHART STRATEGY FOR INVADING OF ENEMY STRONGHOLDS—HOPE FOR TALK IS DIM

(By Seymour Topping)

SAIGON, February 25.—Senior United States and South Vietnamese officials are showing a

new sense of purpose and direction in the war against the Vietcong.

"We have nothing to cheer about except that we have at last defined our problem and we have the go-ahead on a program," one of them explained.

The officials estimate, in their planning, that the war will last from 3 to 7 years. At the moment they are more concerned about the possible adverse reaction of American public opinion to a costly, prolonged struggle than about any of the specific military or political problems within Vietnam.

TROOPS MAY ENTER CAMBODIA

Under the new plans, the level of offensive operations is to be raised as the support capability of U.S. forces is expanded through the improvement of port facilities at Saigon and other harbors extending north to Da Nang. Additional troops are to be brought to Vietnam so that the military commanders will have sufficient forces to strike hard at Vietcong base areas.

Air strikes at communication lines in North Vietnam and infiltration routes through Laos are to be continued. U.S. troops will be permitted to enter Cambodia in pursuit of Vietcong forces and North Vietnamese units that are reported to be based there.

A decision has been postponed on the deployment of U.S. troops in Laos to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail, although senior military officers in Vietnam tend to favor such an operation. The administration has decided against such a move for the present because of the opposition of the Laotian Government and disagreement within the U.S. military leadership over the feasibility of such an operation.

SWEEPS ARE PLANNED

It is within this strategic framework that Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the United States commander in Vietnam, is planning his operations. The general intends to employ U.S. troops, which now number more than 200,000, in a series of sweeps directed at destroying, defeating, or neutralizing the Vietcong's main-force units, which are estimated to total 80,000 men.

Despite private assurances from President Johnson that the administration will prosecute the war as is required, officials in Saigon are wondering whether the American people will tolerate the casualties that are foreseen in the projected military operations.

During periods of maximum combat effort, it is expected that American casualties each month will average about 400 to 500 dead and about 15,000 wounded.

There are no startlingly new features to the war program. The essential difference is that since the Honolulu conference the key U.S. officials here, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, who has overall responsibility for the American field effort; his Deputy Ambassador, William Porter, who is the coordinator in support of the village pacification campaign, and General Westmoreland, have been given a clearer mandate to put the program into effect.

NEGOTIATIONS BELIEVED UNLIKELY

A number of policy options have been discarded or pigeonholed by President Johnson.

Official planning in Saigon no longer takes account of any possibility of peace negotiations with the Vietcong. It is felt that the President's peace offensive was undertaken to demonstrate that the Communists are not interested in negotiations and to assuage public opinion. The President is said now to be bent on action to break the back of the Communist-led insurgency.

Officials here did not weigh seriously the issues raised in the exchanges between President Johnson and Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, over his proposals on the role of the Vietcong. Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, the South Vietnamese Premier, is planning to hold elections late next year, but the 10-member governing military directory says it

has no intention of allowing the Vietcong to vote or to put up candidates.

LANDING IN NORTH DISCARDED

In military policy, two options on action to seal off the South Vietnam battlefield by impeding or discouraging infiltration from North Vietnam have been discarded. One of these was a proposal for an amphibious landing in North Vietnam, near the Vinh region to block the approaches to the infiltration corridor through Laos.

A decision also has been taken against bombing the population centers at Hanoi and Haiphong, although the mining of the channel to the port of Haiphong and the destruction of jet airfields near Hanoi are still under consideration.

General Westmoreland believes that it will take several years to break the Vietcong main force units. Since the Pleime campaign, which began late in October, about 17,000 Vietcong soldiers have been killed, according to official American estimates. Vietcong forces have been provoked into major engagements by U.S. troops penetrating for the first time into some of their base areas.

VIETCONG REPLACING LOSSES

Vietcong losses, in killed and wounded, are being made up by the infiltration of troops from North Vietnam, now estimated to total 4,500 a month, and the drafting of men in South Vietnam.

Under the U.S. military umbrella, the South Vietnamese armed forces, totaling 570,000 men, are to have the principal mission of destroying or dispersing the approximately 110,000 Vietcong guerrillas operating outside the main units.

Once reasonable security is restored to any area, the pacification and rural reconstruction programs are to be instituted. Teams of Vietnamese revolutionary development cadres would cooperate with security forces in rooting out 40,000 Vietcong political and military command and control cadres in the villages.

A modest beginning described by one American official as a small, bite-sized deal, is to be made this year in a pacification program in four selected areas where security conditions are fairly good. At the end of the year a total of 40,000 revolutionary development cadres are scheduled to be in the field, and the pacification areas will be slowly expanded.

REFORM MEASURES PLEDGED

Along with the pacification program, the Ky government is pledged to a program of political democratization and economic reform, which is to be announced soon, to check inflation. Premier Ky has assured U.S. officials that he will introduce a constitution in November well before the elections.

At no stage in the political and military program do American and Vietnamese officials in Saigon foresee an opening of negotiations with the Vietcong toward a peace settlement. The more optimistic of them predict that Hanoi, confronted by a determined military campaign and a successful pacification program, will halt the infiltration to the South and that the Vietcong will gradually disperse in 4 to 5 years.

However, even the most optimistic officials are uneasy about returning to Honolulu next June to meet President Johnson's demand for a demonstration of how many coonskins have been nailed to the wall.

Apart from the results that may be expected in the next months from emergency measures to slow down inflation, no responsible United States or Vietnamese official in Saigon expects to record spectacular gains by as early as next June. One South Vietnamese official wryly said he might have to skin his stuffed tiger to have something to show to the President in Honolulu.

Mr. MORSE. I am always delighted to yield to the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania. On this occasion, I was particularly delighted to yield to him because of the comments which he made, with which I find myself in complete agreement. The particular newspaper article he has discussed contains an accurate portrayal of what I think the policy of this administration will be from the standpoint of escalating the war and expanding the war.

If we authorize the policy contained in the proposed legislation, that is what we shall get by way of an escalated war. That is why I say that now is the time to stop the President by way of exercising congressional checks.

In my speech last Friday, I pointed out that our constitutional fathers wrote into the Constitution itself a check on the purse string. That is what this debate is all about. If we do not want the President to follow a policy, we do not finance the policy. The Constitution provides for that. Yet we heard speeches in the Senate this afternoon which sought to translate this action into a situation in which if we do not authorize this policy, we shall be letting down our forces in South Vietnam.

The Senator from Oregon is seeking to demonstrate that the policy of our Government should be to stop putting those men in South Vietnam in a position where increasing numbers of them will be slaughtered.

Before the intervention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I was discussing the testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations by General Gavin and former Ambassador George Kennan. Let the RECORD show again to those out in the country who will read the RECORD—and as I go about the country, I am pleasantly surprised to learn how many people are reading the RECORD—that it was not so long ago that General Gavin was one of the top military strategists of this country. He is recognized as an exceedingly able military strategist who had the confidence of Congress and the confidence of the President. In my judgment, he continues to be the same able and great strategist.

Read the testimony of General Gavin. His testimony is in opposition to the policy of the bill. The major thesis of this great military strategist is that we should avoid an expanding of the war in Vietnam. The bill before us authorizes an expanding of the war.

Does the bill contain a check? It does not. But, say the proponents of the bill, the war will be expanded only if the President decides to expand it, if we pass the bill. I am sorry to say that I have lost all confidence in the President's not expanding the war. In my judgment, he has been expanding it, expanding it, and expanding it, completely contrary to the promises he made in the 1964 campaign. I campaigned for him in 14 States on the basis of those promises. I see no difference in the result from what the result would have been had his opponent been elected in 1964.

That is why I say to the American people: It is up to you, now, to exercise the check. It is up to you, now, to decide, through the ballot box, whether you want to send increasing numbers of American

boys to their slaughter in a country in which, in my judgment, we do not have the slightest national interest from the standpoint of its being vital to this Republic. But more of that later.

I am for the Gavin enclave program. That will defend our country. I am for the Kennan program. That will defend the interests of our country in Asia. But it will avoid the dangers of carrying out what those two great men fear; namely, an escalated war that will lead to a massive war in Asia, ending in a war with China, and the great probability that after the war with China, we shall be in a war with Russia; and then the third world war will be on.

That is why I said last Friday that the bill is pregnant with policy. The bill is pregnant with the danger of the policy authorized in it that will lead us eventually into a third world war. Now is the time to stop it.

I certainly should not have to review again for the Senate what an authorization bill is.

The President cannot have any policy that can be financed with taxpayers' money that Congress does not authorize with an authorization bill. That is what the President is asking for. I am saying: Do not authorize it in its present form. Do not authorize it until the bill is changed.

Yes, the senior Senator from Oregon takes the position that American troops in Vietnam should not be sent into expanded, aggressive action, but that those troops should be kept in the type of general defensive position that General Gavin alluded to, and which was approved by Ambassador Kennan. That will also, do not forget, give protection to the South Vietnamese Army. That will provide an opportunity for other nations, through existing international procedures under the United Nations or the Geneva accords, to take the multilateral steps necessary to enforce peace in Asia, rather than to make war.

What is needed is for other nations to send over whatever number of divisions of troops are necessary to separate the combatants in this war, to separate the forces of the United States and the South Vietnamese on the one side and the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese on the other. They need to crisscross South Vietnam with whatever number of buffer zones are necessary to be occupied by these peacekeeping forces—either of the United Nations forces or, through the United Nations, the other forces—that could function under the International Control Commission of the Geneva accords until such time as stability can be developed in South Vietnam under that type of protectorate or trusteeship so that self-determination can hold sway and this war area of the world can be returned to peace.

The President and his spokesmen in the Senate keep saying that those of us who oppose the escalation of this war have no program. We have a program, but the administration refuses to join issue on the program. Oh, but they say: "We went to the United Nations."

I am glad that we finally did, but let me say to the administration that that

does not answer the problem of our making use of the United Nations Charter, by saying that at long last we went there.

We went to the United Nations so late that it will take some time to really revive the procedures of the United Nations so that they can be effective. We went to the United Nations with an olive branch in one hand and bombs in the other.

The members of the United Nations are still talking about the bombs. The sad fact is that it is probably going to take some time to get this matter thrashed out in the United Nations and to determine what course of action the signatories may decide to take under that Charter. However, I would have it out in the open and not behind the scenes. I would have the American Ambassador, Mr. Goldberg, given strict instructions to use all the prestige of this Government in insisting that the members of the Security Council get this debate out in the open. Could it be that we are not too enthusiastic about getting it out in the open?

There are commentators in New York City who are pretty well informed as to what goes on behind the scenes in the United Nations. I know how those findings can be made, because I was a delegate to the United Nations in the 15th General Assembly. I know something about the backstage maneuverings of the United Nations.

There are commentators that are writing and observing these days that the United States is not taking a very effective, positive role in trying to get the matter out in the open. There is the process of so-called negotiating and maneuvering behind the scenes.

Mr. President, the stakes are so great, and the crisis so serious that, in my judgment, the time has come for the world to hear an open discussion of the crisis in South Vietnam, and an open debate in the meetings of the Security Council, just as, in my judgment, the American people are entitled to have a continuation of the public hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee and to hear a list of witnesses that ought to be heard for the information of the American people in respect to the crisis in Asia.

With regard to the Vice President of the United States making the most unfortunate remarks that he has been making in recent days to the effect that there has been enough talk in the Committee on Foreign Relations and in public hearings, I want to say to my Vice President that, in my judgment, the Foreign Relations Committee has only started to present the facts about the war in southeast Asia to the American people.

The Vice President of the United States does not move me in the slightest with his clear implication in opposition to further public discussions of this issue by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Vice President is certainly anxious to keep talking about the war in Asia. He talks about it on television, and I understand he plans many speaking engagements all around the country to talk about the war.

What he means is only that he does not want to talk to the Foreign Relations Committee because members of the committee can talk back. That is not what the Vice President is seeking.

The Vice President ought to volunteer to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee. The Vice President ought to be willing to attend a public hearing and be questioned before the Foreign Relations Committee. The Vice President ought to be willing to answer whatever questions members of the Foreign Relations Committee want to ask him in respect to his commitment abroad, under what authority he made those commitments, what instructions he acted upon, and what the legal bases for the commitments are.

Mr. President, I do not have to explain to any Senator my years of shoulder-to-shoulder working with the Vice President of the United States.

It is a matter of great sadness to me that I find myself entertaining such deep feelings of keen disappointment in regard to the position taken by the Vice President of the United States, both procedurally and substantively, in regard to the war in southeast Asia. For I cannot interpret the remarks of the Vice President of the United States in any other light than that the Vice President seems to be of the opinion that we can bomb people to a negotiating table and that that will result in peace. We can bomb people to a negotiating table, all right, and bring them in as surrenderees, but no surrender will give us peace.

Let the record be perfectly clear that, concerning the controversy between the Vice President of the United States and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], I am on the side of the Senator from New York, and millions of other Americans are, too.

In due course of time I am satisfied that increasing millions of Americans will be on the side of the Senator from New York, too, for I am satisfied that more and more millions of Americans are going to register their protest against the program that the Vice President of the United States is seeking to sell to the American people. I am convinced that he will never be able to convince them, because he is dead wrong in his major premises.

It is interesting to hear the talk of the Vice President and of the President and of Secretary Rusk and of Secretary McNamara and the rest of them, in their effort to seek to justify the course of action that we are following in Vietnam because of the nature of the Vietcong soldiery. There is no question about the fact that they are engaging in great terrorism and inhumanity. There is no question about the fact that they have committed murder. There is no question about the fact that they are engaged in brutality. However, so are the South Vietnamese soldiery.

This administration will not tell the American people the facts about the terror and atrocities of the South Vietnamese soldiery. One has to get that information from the foreign press. One has to get the pictures of their brutality out of the foreign press. Only the

pictures of Vietcong terrorism appear in the American press.

This is another part of the failure of this administration to tell the American people the whole story.

Mr. President, we are dealing with the Vietnam soldiery on both sides, with a people who do not have our same culture, do not have our same sense of values, do not have the same understanding of the principles of morality that characterize the philosophy of the American people. We are dealing with a people who have been engaged in a civil war—and an administration almost aghast if we point out that we have gotten ourselves involved in taking sides in a civil war. But so we have.

We do not find the administration talking about who the Vietcong are. The Vietcong are men, women, and children who also are South Vietnamese. Even the latest statistics of the Pentagon, Mr. President, leave no room for doubt that the great majority of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese and not even North Vietnamese. But even if there was a large percentage who were North Vietnamese, do not forget, they would be Vietnamese.

The administration has succeeded in convincing many in the American public that there are two entirely different peoples involved as combatants and adversaries in this war in South Vietnam. They are all Vietnamese; all of them. If we walked 100 of them into this Chamber, 50 North Vietnamese and 50 South Vietnamese, no one would be able to tell the difference. That is one of the sad things about the situation. This is a war involving one indigenous population. For that matter, Mr. President, it is a war that, from the very beginning, has had as one of its major objectives the reunification of all of Vietnam.

One of the interesting things is that we are supporting Ky, when in my judgment, on his record, he is entitled to no support from the United States. That fact will rise to plague us throughout history. But we are supporting Ky, and one of the objectives is to put Ky in charge, eventually, ruling all of Vietnam, south and north.

Mr. President, we have made enough mistakes. We made the inexcusable mistake of setting up a government in South Vietnam that the Geneva accords themselves prohibit. We did it. The Geneva accords provide for no government in South Vietnam. The United States provided for that.

I wonder if that may be one of the reasons why there seems to be a somewhat lackadaisical attitude on the part of our country toward suggestions of a full public debate before the Security Council. For, of course, a full public debate before the Security Council would result in making a matter of record many of the wrongdoings of the United States in South Vietnam. We do not like to have our deprecations made of such historical record.

The Vietcong, as I say, are men, women, and children. They comprise a substantial population. They occupy and control two-thirds of the land area of South Vietnam.

For a long time, there has been great conflict between the rural populations of Vietnam and Saigon. There is nothing new about that. Last Friday, I pointed out in my speech the story in Friday morning's newspapers of a military engagement that was taking place in South Vietnam, where Vietcong women and children were carrying in to the troops the ammunition and military supplies and bringing out the wounded and the dead.

Not a civil war? Not a war in which two large divisive groups of an indigenous population are in mortal combat?

But they have been battle-torn for years and years, and they are struggling to get the conflict ended. We, the Senate of the most powerful nation in the world, have before us a bill by which we are proposing to authorize an expansion or escalation of that war at the discretion of one man, the President of the United States. And I still hear people talking about a government by law instead of a government by men, when what we are doing is leading this country, through such legislation as this, faster and faster down the road toward government by executive supremacy and secrecy in this country.

I say to the American people, "Your fundamental rights are being jeopardized by such legislation as this. You must hold to an accounting any administration that supports it. For only you, the people, can end it."

I am satisfied, Mr. President, that although it will prove costly, the American people will eventually end it. For I am satisfied that the American people, once they come to understand what is developing in this country, will do whatever is necessary to keep themselves free. And their freedom depends upon the maintenance and, now, the needed strengthening of our system of government, based upon three coordinate and coequal branches of government—which the people are rapidly losing.

When we have a President of the United States going to the press, when he is asked about the suggestion that the Tonkin Bay resolution of August 1964 should be rescinded in the opinion of some, and saying, in effect, that he does not need that resolution in order to continue the war, we have all I need to know about a President who apparently is losing his sensitiveness in connection with our precious constitutional system of checks and balances, who apparently has come to the conclusion that he is powerful enough to follow whatever course of action he decides he wishes to follow in regard to the war.

I say to the American people, "Watch such a President." I say to the American people, "When you get a President expressing such opinion, you had better make clear to him that you, the people, are still supreme."

Or are they? Let us hope so.

Let us hope that the American people will restate that supremacy immediately.

These are some of the views held by me in what I consider to be this critical hour, views which will cause me, tomorrow, to offer one of the two amendments which I shall now proceed to discuss.

First, let me say to the acting majority leader, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], that a few moments ago I stated that there was going to be a meeting at a quarter after 5 of a group which was considering the possibility of trying to reach a consensus of opinion with regard to a possible substitute amendment for my amendment.

A few moments ago, the acting majority leader and the presiding officer witnessed my yielding to the Senator from Pennsylvania so that he could make the intervention statement he made, while I discussed the matter with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. The Senator from Alaska was sent to me by the group with certain information, and all I am privileged to say is that the message was that they hoped I would not offer an amendment tonight.

Let the RECORD show that I stated to the Senator from Alaska, "I cannot continue postponing offering an amendment on the floor of the Senate. I am willing to cooperate as a member of a team, and I am willing to cooperate in any way, but, after all, the RECORD shows that last week in colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Illinois, I stated that I thought we could get to a vote possibly on one of my amendments by Friday night; and then on Friday I said that I thought we could get to an amendment on Monday."

Mr. President, this is not a question of breaking my word, because my word is my bond, and I believe that everyone in the Senate will understand that it is not a question of breaking my word; but a condition which did not exist last Friday, and a condition which did not exist earlier in the week when we discussed my reasons for objecting to any unanimous consent agreement to limit time, have developed today, conditions which were not even thought of by me, or anyone else in the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am not going to offer an amendment tonight. I am going to discuss an amendment tonight.

I had made clear to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and he has undoubtedly, by now, transmitted this information back to the group, that unless they have something to submit to me tomorrow which I will find acceptable as a substitute for my amendment, or one of my two amendments which I am about to discuss, I shall offer an amendment. So far as I am concerned, I have cooperated on this matter. I think they know that I have cooperated in this matter to the extent that they or anyone else has a right to expect me to cooperate if I am going to protect my reputation in the Senate to the other side. They are pressing me to offer the amendment—and they have a right to press me for it—even though some of them have been unkind enough to suggest that there is some kind of filibuster which began on the floor of the Senate—which is pure nonsense, so far as I am concerned.

Therefore, Mr. President, I thought that you and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] should know what my pro-

cedure will be; that I am going to make certain arguments in regard to the two amendments, one of which I shall not offer, certainly not unless the groups to which I have already referred has a substitute which I can accept. I have heard nothing from them yet which convinces me that anything they will propose will be more acceptable than my amendment.

Of course, I understand the views of those who believe that because my amendment will not receive many votes, somehow that will strengthen the administration's hand for further escalation of the war, and will be interpreted as approval of further escalating the war.

I cannot accept that argument. That is for the President to decide. But the American people are entitled to know where Congress stands.

There are a considerable number of Senators who would prefer not to be placed in the position which my amendment would place them in—and there are a considerable number of Senators—but all the American people have to do is take note of their public statements in recent weeks. They have had some serious, second thoughts about the resolution of August 1964, and have publicly stated—and I summarize the collective views of the group—that when they voted for the resolution in August 1964, they did not intend to give the President the power which he has exercised in escalating the war to the degree that he has.

The RECORD is perfectly clear, as will be seen in part shortly—I am only going to quote from parts of it as to what transpired on the floor of the Senate in August 1964 when this unfortunate resolution was passed, with only the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself voting against it. Senators should not have voted for it then. In my judgment, in this bill, Senators should not, in effect, vote for its continuation now.

I speak respectfully, but with deep sincerity, because such votes will mean the sending of additional boys to death in South Vietnam, who should not be called upon to die because they are involved on battlefronts that do not involve the vital interests of the United States.

Therefore, we should adopt the General Gavin approach—called, for want of a better term, an enclave—to put us in a defensive position which will save those lives and provide the time for other nations to recognize how serious the import to the threat to the peace of the world is in southeast Asia, and come to recognize the terrific stake they have from the standpoint of the future of their own countries to carry out their obligations under existing international law and treaty commitments to enforce a peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, that is what I am pleading for.

I am engaging in no sentimentality—I say this because of the criticism I know I shall receive—when I say that my personal philosophy is one of the belief that the holy of holies does not happen to be the material symbolism of a religious edifice, but that the holy of holies happens to be each person's conscience; and

when one sits in that citadel, he never sits alone. I have meditated on it hour upon hour in the last 2 years, and I am satisfied that, as a matter of conscience, I cannot support my President's course of action in southeast Asia in connection with this war because I consider it to be both illegal and immoral.

I think this is an immoral war, and I have no doubt that there is not the slightest legal basis for our course of action, the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association to the contrary notwithstanding. But let me say that a resolution is not proof. That is why the Foreign Relations Committee wired the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association to send us a memorandum in support of its resolution. We are waiting for it.

Mr. President, if anything is clear to the Congress and to the American people today, it is that infinitely more is being contemplated under the Tonkin Bay resolution than ever was contemplated by the Congress which passed it.

I do not want to take Senators into a long controversy over what the President may or may not do by way of using the Armed Forces of the United States for purposes of furthering American defense or security interests. But some things are matters of ascertainable fact.

One of them is that the Tonkin Bay resolution resulted from the naval action in the Bay of Tonkin. American military vessels were fired on in international waters. They fired back. When fired on a second time, they fired back and sent aircraft from carriers to shoot up the bases in North Vietnam from which their PT boats came. The purpose of the resolution as represented by the administration at the time was to gain an ex post facto endorsement of that use of the Commander in Chief's powers to command the Armed Forces of the United States.

Of course, the resolution contained many open-ended ambiguities, which was why I voted against it. One of them was the language whereby Congress supported and approved the determination of the President to take all necessary measures "to prevent further aggression." Any time a nation, much less a President, undertakes to prevent aggression or any other potential act by another nation, it is talking about preventive war.

The words "to prevent further aggression" had absolutely no qualifying language. Not a hint is there as to what country might be considered to be preparing aggression, whether North Vietnam, China, the Soviet Union, or who. Not a word of definition appears as to what may constitute evidence that aggression is being planned or set in motion.

In August of 1964, moreover, Congress was assured that the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was not at issue. Secretary Rusk told the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator FURBRIGHT, who was managing the resolution, passed on the word to the Senate, that SEATO was not involved in the resolution, and was not being invoked.

Now, as an afterthought, grasping for straws, this administration finds itself in a drowning position so far as justification for its situation in southeast Asia is concerned; we find the Secretary of State trying to justify our course of action on the basis of SEATO.

I answered that statement in detail last Friday, and I stand on the answer.

Four international law authorities have called me since and told me they completely agree with my analysis of last Friday. I am asking to have them called before the Foreign Relations Committee in public session. The American people are entitled to know it from their lips.

That was the situation in August of 1964. It is not the situation today. In February of 1966, the SEATO treaty is cited over and over again by the President and the Secretary of State as the basis for our war effort in Vietnam. And it is not just the paragraph of the treaty that calls for consultation among the parties in case of subversion in the treaty area. No, the Secretary of State now tells the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that we are obliged to do what we are doing by paragraph 1 of article IV of that treaty.

It reads:

Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

It was brought out many times in the Senate debate on ratification of the SEATO treaty that any action taken by the United States to meet an armed aggression would have to be undertaken "in accordance with its constitutional processes."

I submit that the Secretary of State and the administration violate that treaty when they act under this paragraph without resorting to the constitutional processes of the U.S. Constitution.

I am aware that mention is made of the SEATO treaty in the 1964 resolution. But we are also told in 1964 that the treaty was not being invoked. I am also aware that in colloquy with Senator COOPER, Senator FULBRIGHT expressed the opinion that the Tonkin Bay resolution could be an authorization for the President to act under SEATO. But he reiterated that this was not the request nor the position of the administration.

We had every right to rely upon the representations of the administration that presented the treaty to the Senate.

There is no question as to the representations of Secretary of State Dulles. They are opposite from the representations made by Secretary Rusk before the Foreign Relations Committee in February 1966.

I discussed that last Friday, and shall not go into it in detail again tonight.

So we have a fact situation wherein the administration is citing Public Law 88-408 for use for purposes that it as-

sured us at the time would not be undertaken.

In 1957, we had a somewhat analogous situation in the so-called Middle East resolution. Senators debated and discussed then many of the same issues at stake here.

Probably the best analysis of the 1957 resolution was offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and I shall quote some paragraphs from his remarkable speech of February 11, 1957:

This will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 2, page 1856.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I put the question as I have, it is because that is precisely the way Senate Joint Resolution 19 puts it. In form and substance, the resolution, as prepared by the administration, wants something from this Chamber, the mere asking of which would have led to a national outcry under any other administration back to Washington's. It asks for a blank grant of power over our funds and Armed Forces, to be used in a blank way, for a blank length of time, under blank conditions, with respect to blank nations, in a blank area. We are asked to sign this blank check in perpetuity or at the pleasure of the President—any President.

Who will fill in all these blanks?

The resolution says that the President, whoever he may be at the time, shall do it. And that is not all it says. It says that in filling in the blanks, the President need not consult, much less be accountable to any other constitutional organ of government. He shall be the counsel, the judge, and the jury of the national interest.

His judgment about world realities shall be the sole warrant for his deeds in committing our forces to battle, and our funds to who knows what purpose.

His office shall be the only archive holding the record of his transactions, except as he reports the results once a year to the Congress.

How are we as Senators to react to all this?

Is the form and substance of the resolution consistent with the kind of constitutional government all of us in this Chamber took an oath to uphold?

This is the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and not the senior Senator from Oregon speaking. But this is the same thesis of constitutional checks and balances that the senior Senator from Oregon has defended and sought to uphold on the floor of the Senate for 20 years. It is basic in the preservation and perpetuation of this form of government.

I voted against the resolution in 1957 because I considered this case made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] unanswerable. It was unanswerable then. It is unanswerable today. It is unanswerable when applied to the pending measure before the Senate because this authorization bill also violates this system of checks.

I continue the argument of 1957 of the Senator from Arkansas:

Is the form and substance of the resolution consistent with the kind of constitutional government all of us in this Chamber took an oath to uphold? In the name of defending liberty abroad, are we, as Senators, henceforth to be deaf, dumb, and blind in the way we discharge our constitutional rights and duties in the conduct of foreign affairs? Do my colleagues believe that the President, any

President, and his Secretary of State will be wiser and more effective, or more foresighted, in protecting the interests of our people if they are relieved of the necessity of consulting with and of justifying their actions to the Congress? Do you, my colleagues, representing 48 sovereign States, really desire to be rid of your power to influence the conduct of our foreign affairs?

You may ask: "In what way does the resolution abridge the constitutional principles of the separation of legislative and executive powers and the power of the Congress to declare war?"

The answer is that it does this in two ways: First, there is the fact that this is not a Senate resolution or a concurrent resolution having only the force of advice on policy. It is a joint resolution. This means that it has the force of law.

The second way is related to the first. Since the joint resolution has the force of law, it represents, in its substantive content, a blanket transfer to the Executive, of the constitutional right vested in the Congress to declare war. This, indeed, is a startling innovation. The Constitution, as we inherited it from the past, provided in effect that the Congress would declare war on a case-to-case basis. Under the joint resolution, however, the Congress stockpiles a batch of hypothetical declarations of war, covering a variety of possible contingencies. Then it says to the President: "Here they are. Now that you have them, you can take us into war—if that is your pleasure—in the confident knowledge that whatever you do, you have a legal basis for it."

Mr. President, I have read many and many a treatise on the subject of separation of powers, including volumes, but none appears anywhere that is such a succinct, concise, penetrating, unanswerable statement of the separation of powers doctrine as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] presented in that historic speech of February 11, 1957. Every word of it is apropos to the resolution of August 1964. Every word of it is applicable to the pending business before the Senate. Every word of it sets out in crystal form the major thesis of the objection of the senior Senator from Oregon to the resolution of 1964, and to the pending bill.

I do not want to quote the Senator from Arkansas out of context or put words in his mouth, so let me add that it was his opinion that the President had the authority to use the Armed Forces of the United States in the Middle East without the adoption of any resolution.

As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senate knows, with that premise I completely disagree. But his objection went to the blank check nature of the resolution which endorsed in advance any action the President might take even if it led to a massive war, without coming back to Congress.

I think I interpret his speech correctly when I say it was his view that the President could act to use the Armed Forces, but that when a fact situation indicated that hostilities in the magnitude of a war were imminent or contemplated, the President must act jointly with Congress and not alone.

In my opinion, those views are entirely applicable to the situation we are in today. There are those constitutional authorities, and undoubtedly, there are many more in the executive branch, who

will argue that the President needs nothing at all from Congress insofar as action under SEATO is concerned. If so, they must ignore the language of the treaty itself, which states that action under this particular paragraph shall occur only in accordance with our constitutional processes.

In my opinion, the views of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], previously quoted, are applicable to the issue that is now before the Senate.

The views of the administration also ignore the very grave dangers that any administration runs when it carries the Nation into a foreign adventure without close and continuous congressional consultation, debate, and support.

Also in 1957, the then Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, had much to say on this point. He said, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 2, page 1864:

The resolution which is before us is tied not to the constitutional realities of the President's powers; nor is it tied to the international realities which, in part, may be due to the failure of policies on the part of this Government, but it is tied to the political realities. This administration does not wish to move until it hog-ties every Member of Congress.

As the Senator from Arkansas well stated, the resolution, in effect, was a means of putting the cork into the bottle of Eisenhower-Dulles mistakes, so that we could no longer examine the ingredients thereof. It was designed to seal that cork by the vote of every Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I am perfectly willing to withhold the cork. I was one of those who wanted to take a look at what was in the bottle—the mistakes of yesterday, or, if that be considered an uncharitable expression, the accomplishments of yesterday. But I do not believe in sealing the political jug. I think we are trying to be a little too polite with one another when we say this is a great constitutional issue.

In fact, what has been presented to us by the Secretary of State is his interpretation of how to quell the revolt in the ranks of the American people and the Congress of the United States over the mistakes of the Eisenhower foreign policy. That is what we have had laid before us. It will require more than a resolution to still what I believe to be a legitimate complaint against the mistakes of this administration in the field of foreign policy.

I am perfectly willing to argue constitutional questions involved. The Secretary of State did not argue them well. He argued them very poorly in the presence of the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE. He did not argue the urgency of the situation very well, in the light of the testimony of Admiral Radford.

The only thing he argued was that the resolution was for peace. Whenever this administration runs out of legitimate arguments, it asks: "Are you against peace?" It can come forward with any kind of concoction, and if anyone is against it, he is against peace. I do not believe we can get peace or solve problems by hastily passing resolutions. We can do it by carefully designed, proposed, and executed policies and programs under mature leadership; and we are lacking in that respect.

That is not the senior Senator from Oregon speaking; that was the former Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, who is now the Vice President of the

United States, speaking on February 11, 1957. I continue to quote him, as his remarks appear on page 1877:

One of the weaknesses I see in the so-called Eisenhower doctrine or resolution is that it was the effect of making the people believe that we have some answers to the Middle East crisis. Thus it becomes a diplomatic barbiturate, a diplomatic opiate, which calms one's nerves and puts him away into a kind of slumberland, when, in fact, the illness still persists, and the drug has in no way relieved the pain or distress.

I do not know of anyone better qualified to discuss the effect of drugs than one with the pharmaceutical background of the Vice President of the United States. He continued:

For that reason, I believe that the President was unwise when he asked the Congress to adopt his resolution. The fact that he could formulate a policy for the Middle East and publicize it for the world without prior consultation with the Congress is to be decried. It shows a greater concern for public relations than it does for the public interest.

Mr. President, I digress to say that such a statement is just as applicable when the President is a Democratic President as when he is a Republican President. The same argument against vesting this kind of unchecked power in a President is applicable to a Democratic President if his name is Lyndon Johnson as it was to a Republican President whose name was Dwight D. Eisenhower. I continue to quote the Vice President, then a Senator from Minnesota, speaking in this body on February 11, 1957:

Let me say too, Mr. President, that I deeply regret that during the course of the President's campaign for reelection in 1956, he misled the American people into believing that prospects for peace were great as a result of the activities of his administration.

Mr. President, I digress to say, as I have already expressed the view, that I resent the present President of the United States running for office on one platform, on which the American people were led to believe that he would not involve us in an escalated war in southeast Asia, and then shortly after his election taking us into an escalated war without, in my judgment, following constitutional processes.

I continue to quote from the speech of former Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota, now the Vice President of the United States, on February 11, 1957:

In fact, the dangers facing our Nation and the world increased materially during the course of the last 4 years. There is no doubt in my mind that the story is correct in the U.S. News & World Report to the effect that Mr. Eisenhower came to the Congress with his plan in order to counterbalance the erroneous impression that he had helped build up abroad during the campaign that he would go to any lengths to avoid war, even at the sacrifice of our country's national interests in the Middle East. In spite of that fact and in spite of that background, I would like to be able to vote for the Eisenhower doctrine and thus not contribute to a serious divisive face abroad which could be interpreted as a sign of weakness by our enemies. I can only do so, however, if the inadequacies of the Eisenhower doctrine are corrected and if the Congress sets about to place that so-called doctrine within the context of a more constructive national policy.

Here is the effect of the administration's proposal as I see it:

By making it appear that what the administration requests is support for a policy, while in actuality it is rather a declaration of general intent, the Congress would be committed, in advance of their elaboration, to the support of future policies, of whose substance the Congress is at present totally ignorant. The administration asks authority to use force. But it has remained silent about the substantive policies in whose support it intends to use that force, the ostensible one of defense against Soviet aggression not necessarily being the real one.

I shall not go into the constitutional issues involved in Senate Joint Resolution 19, inasmuch as I participated in the colloquy this afternoon with the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT. However, I repeat that, no matter how we look at the constitutional issue, this resolution does not clarify it. It continues to confuse the issue. First, it confuses the question of the responsibility of the Congress relating to its power to declare war; and secondly, it sets a bad precedent with respect to the Executive's use of his constitutional powers to protect the vital interests of this country as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

What the Senator from Minnesota said on February 11, 1957, in regard to the Eisenhower resolution, in my opinion, is equally applicable to the resolution of August 6, 1964, and, for that matter, it is equally applicable to the policies that are inherent in the pending bill before the Senate.

There is another section of the RECORD, volume 103, part 2, page 1881, that I should like to read. It involves a colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

It reads:

Mr. LONG. The Senator has made a suggestion which occurred to me. I regret that I did not attempt to develop it with the Secretary of State when he was before the Committee. Perhaps my success in getting an answer to it would have been no better than it was with respect to some of the other questions which I propounded to him. But I certainly think we should take the attitude that not only the Security Council of the United Nations, which is subject to a veto by any of the major powers, but also the General Assembly of the United Nations, will be respected by the United States.

It seems to me that in the areas which could lead to a third world war, when a crisis develops we should always be willing to submit our case to an international forum. Thus far we have been willing to abide by the views of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and, as we well know, although the Security Council has repeatedly failed to act to solve the problems, the United Nations General Assembly has proved itself capable of arriving at a decision.

That is not the senior Senator from Oregon speaking. That is the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. However, when the Senator from Louisiana sets forth that point of view, he sets forth a major thesis that the senior Senator from Oregon has advocated on the floor of the Senate for well nigh onto 2½ years with regard to southeast Asia. I advocated it on last Friday and again this afternoon.

If we cannot get the Security Council to assume its obligations under the charter, then we should take the matter to the General Assembly, and I think they will take jurisdiction.

Mr. HUMPHREY replied to Mr. LONG with these words: "The Senator is correct."

Senator LONG continued:

Mr. LONG. The Uniting for Peace resolution came, as the Senator may recall, when the Soviet Union had returned to the United Nations Security Council, following the terrible Korean war. The United States and the United Nations forces working together brought forth this kind of resolution. It has been found that the General Assembly has been able to take very constructive action under the terms of the resolution.

The Senator knows, with all due deference to the President's intentions—and I am certain that his intentions are good and meaningful—the truth of the matter is that when he told us he would be willing to accept the view of the Security Council of the United Nations, he was making a very meaningless statement, because obviously any Communist country which is a member of the Security Council, particularly the Soviet Union, will veto any action by the United States to outlaw Communist aggression.

It is like having the President say in this instance that he would be willing to obey the General Assembly whenever Russia is in a position to veto the action by the Security Council, and the resolution is directed against Communist aggression. It goes without saying that it would be a meaningless gesture.

If the President said he would abide by the recommendations of the General Assembly of the United Nations, then he would be making a commitment to subject to an element of international restraint his power to use the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course the Senator from Louisiana is correct, and I have accommodated his point in my suggestion, since Security Council action depends on Soviet agreement, the Uniting for Peace procedure is all the more relevant.

UNITED NATIONS POLICE

Second. The second principle which should motivate our policies in the Middle East is to do what we can as a Nation to strengthen the military forces of the United Nations in the Middle East. We should use appropriations hitherto made pursuant to the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, to furnish facilities and military assistance to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East.

Within the councils of the United Nations, we should initiate proposals for the immediate strengthening in size, flexibility, and continuity of this existing U.N. force. Our objective should be not only to utilize it for current purposes, that is, to interpose the U.N. troops between Israel and Egypt and at such strategic assignments as the Gaza Strip, the Straits of Tiran, and the Sinai frontier outposts, but we should also use the U.N. force as a permanent body ready for service any place in the Middle East, as circumstances may demand.

What an interesting thing it is that our recent foreign policy has been characterized by a resort to armed force when it suited the national interests of the United States, and a lecturing posture about the need to adhere to the rule of law when armed force has been used by others.

Senators who objected to the failure of the Eisenhower administration to rely upon the United Nations in the Middle East also referred frequently to the pronouncement of President Eisenhower himself when armed forces were used by others, even by those friendly to the United States.

In October of 1956, when Britain and France got together with Israel to invade Egypt after she seized the Suez Canal, President Eisenhower told the nations:

In all the recent troubles in the Middle East, there have indeed been injustices suffered by all nations involved. But I do not believe that another injustice—war—is the remedy for those wrongs.

Mr. President, I quote further from President Eisenhower from a State Department bulletin dated November 12, 1956, as follows:

Upon this decision, events followed swiftly. On Sunday (October 28) the Israel Government ordered total mobilization. On Monday, their armed forces penetrated deeply into Egypt and to the vicinity of the Suez Canal, nearly 100 miles away. And on Tuesday, the British and French Governments delivered a 12-hour ultimatum to Israel and Egypt—now followed up by armed attack against Egypt.

The United States was not consulted in any way about any phase of these actions. Nor were we informed of them in advance.

As it is the manifest right of any of these nations to take such decisions and actions, it is likewise our right—if our judgment so dictates—to dissent. We believe these actions to have been taken in error. For we do not accept the use of force as a wise or proper instrument for the settlement of international disputes.

To say this in this particular instance is in no way to minimize our friendship with these nations nor our determination to remain and to strengthen the bonds among us. And we are fully aware of the grave anxieties of Israel, of Britain, and of France. We know that they have been subjected to grave and repeated provocations.

The present fact, nonetheless, seems clear: The actions taken can scarcely be reconciled with the principles and purposes of the United Nations to which we have all subscribed. And, beyond this, we are forced to doubt even if resort to war will for long serve the permanent interests of the attacking nations.

FUTURE U.S. POLICY

Now we must look to the future.

In the circumstances I have described, there will be no U.S. involvement in these present hostilities. I therefore have no plan to call the Congress in special session. Of course, we shall continue to keep in contact with congressional leaders of both parties. At the same time it is—and it will remain—the dedicated purpose of your Government to do all in its power to localize the fighting and to end the conflict.

We took our first measure in this action yesterday. We went to the United Nations Security Council with a request that the forces of Israel return to their own land and that hostilities in the area be brought to a close. This proposal was not adopted, because it was vetoed by Great Britain and France.

The processes of the United Nations, however, are not exhausted. It is our hope and intent that this matter will be brought to the United Nations General Assembly. There with no veto operating, the opinion of the world can be brought to bear in our quest for a just end to this tormenting problem. In the past the United Nations has proved able to find a way to end bloodshed. We believe it can and will do so again.

That was the position of a President in the Suez crisis. There was the President saying that they planned to take it to the General Assembly for veto in the Security Council. It has been the plea

of the senior Senator from Oregon for more than 2 years, as it is my plea tonight, that that is where we should be concentrating our effort. That is why I said earlier in this speech we should follow the advice of that great military strategist, General Gavin, and the great former Ambassador to Russia, George Kennan, adopt their enclave approach, and get on with the job of using the prestige and influence of this Nation to try to get the matter resolved in the Security Council; and failing there, if we fail, call for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly, and call upon the nations of the world, under the provisions of the charter, to enforce the peace in south-east Asia.

Mr. President, it was a sound policy when enunciated by President Eisenhower as the proper approach to the threat to the peace in 1956. It is the proper approach now. We seek to bring to an end the slaughtering, not only of American boys, but of human beings involved in both sides of the war in south-east Asia.

I continue reading the position of President Eisenhower:

My fellow citizens, as I review the march of world events in recent years, I am even more deeply convinced that the processes of the United Nations need further to be developed and strengthened. I speak particularly of increasing its ability to secure justice under international law.

In all the recent troubles in the Middle East, there have indeed been injustices suffered by all nations involved. But I do not believe that another instrument of injustice—war—is the remedy for these wrongs.

President Dwight Eisenhower was right in 1956. The same principle that he advocated then is correct today. War is not the way to peace in Asia. War is the way to a holocaust.

Said the President:

There can be no peace without law. And there can be no law if we were to invoke one code of international conduct for those who oppose us and another for our friends.

The society of nations has been slow in developing means to apply this truth. But the passionate longing for peace on the part of all peoples of the earth compels us to speed our search for new and more effective instruments of justice. The peace we seek and need means much more than mere absence of war. It means the acceptance of law, and the fostering of justice, in all the world. To our principles guiding us in this quest we must stand fast. In so doing we can honor the hopes of all men for a world in which peace will truly and justly reign.

The injustices, and the charges and counter-charges of who violated international law first, and who took the first steps to resort to armed force, that characterized the struggle in the Suez area in 1956 have their counterparts in south-east Asia today. But today, it is the United States that is involved; so we drag out the double standard and find that resort to force is quite justified so long as it is the United States that is resorting to it.

That is why we find ourselves so far down the road to war in Asia, and that is why it is my fear that if we pass this authorization bill, the escalated war can very well end in a war with China. That

is why Congress has seen things done to escalate and expand the war that it did not contemplate would be done under Public Law 88-408 of 1964.

The intent and the spirit of that resolution have been vastly exceeded by our President. I believe it should be withdrawn.

So, Mr. President, I have two amendments that I shall consider offering. One of my amendments reads as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"Sec. 402. The joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia', approved August 10, 1964 (78 Stat. 384) is hereby repealed."

Now, the resolution itself, Mr. President, that was adopted in August 1964, provided a rescission clause within it. It provided that the resolution should prevail until rescinded by the Congress. I think this is a very direct approach to the issue. When I read what Senators have said, when I listen to Senators expressing their views on the reasons for their course of action in August 1964, I should think they would want an opportunity to modify their position by votes.

Yes, the argument is made that it puts Senators on the spot, puts Senators in the position where they have to go on record as opposed to their President. I have never been able to understand what is wrong about doing that. For I hold to the point of view that if they think that their President is wrong, then they owe him the trust of doing what they can in his own best interests, to correct his mistakes or prevent him from continuing a mistake.

If they really believe—and they talk that language—that the President is exercising a power that he should not be exercising to the degree he has, they should be willing to vote for its modification. They should go on record to change the point of view which they expressed in August 1964. Oh, but they say, in the second place, I will not get many votes, and it will have the effect of causing the President to go further. I do not buy that argument, either. For, after all, the American people are entitled to have Senators vote and determine whether they wish to vote in support of their views for modifying the position which they took in August 1964.

I hope that we have not come to a position in the Senate that we should not consider a direct approach to the problem merely because there will only be few votes to sustain rescission. The people are entitled to know how many votes there will be. The people are entitled to know for their own benefit, when they come to exercise that greatest of all checking powers; namely, the right of the people to the ballot box, to check their elected representatives in both branches of Government—legislative and executive.

I say that unless a substitute is offered, which in my judgment will be preferable to this amendment, I feel it is my clear duty and trust, and in response to the dictates of my conscience, to offer this amendment tomorrow, or an alternative one.

I will give further consideration to the second one, which reads as follows:

At the end of the bill, add a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 402. It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that the enactment of joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to promote maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia,' approved August 10, 1964 (78 Stat. 384), does not constitute, and should not be construed as constituting, compliance with the constitutional processes referred to in paragraph 1, article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty."

Mr. President, I know that some Senators would welcome this amendment in preference to a rescission amendment, because they would feel it at least puts them on record as not intending on August 10, 1964, to give to the President the sweeping powers which he has read according to their sights—into the resolution of August 10, 1964.

Mr. President, my present feeling is that the country needs to know just where the Senate stands in regard to the resolution of August 10, 1964. It is entitled to know whether Senators, in fact, have modified the position which they took on August 10, 1964. They are entitled to know the clarifications on the position the Senate took on August 10, 1964, by a new vote in the Senate.

There is just no substitute for a vote in clarifying a position of a Senator.

It is probably true that there will not be many Senators who will vote for the rescission amendment, if I offer it tomorrow; but the American people will know what that vote is. I am satisfied that the American people will take note of it. The defeat of my amendment will not end the issue but that that vote will produce a reaction in the country showing renewed public concern about what more and more people are coming to recognize is a serious danger; namely, that the President is going to escalate the war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article published in the February issue of the Frontier magazine, entitled "Our Futile War in Vietnam" with a subtitle "Escalation will lead us into a hopeless trap," written by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I completely agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] and point out again that the pending authorization bill in the Senate will lead to the escalation he warns about, that the authority is granted in there, that most people do not comprehend the fact that the authority in this bill is to finance, for example, the military operations in South Vietnam and the Philippines and Thailand vis-a-vis the war in Vietnam.

That will lead to many serious complications.

The bill provides that it shall be done as determined by the Secretary of Defense—of course, in consultation with the President. That vests power—which should not be vested—in the Secretary of

Defense. It will lead, in my judgment, to the establishment of bases in South Vietnam which will be under American control for many years to come. That is why—when the President said in his speech in New York City the other night at the Freedom Awards banquet that we seek no bases—I believe that he is mistaken as to what the policy of his own administration is. We cannot spend these billions of dollars building American bases and not know that the United States is going to maintain a foothold on those bases for a long time to come. In fact, in Japan today, one of the great controversies ranging there is over Okinawa and our naval bases in Japan. It is a controversial, political issue in Japan.

The peace treaty calls for us to get out of Okinawa. There is a saving clause in it, but it is a saving clause put in it by the victor. When there are agreements of that type, with the victor in negotiation with the vanquished, we can take notice that there is not an equality of bargaining at that negotiating table. There was not an equality of bargaining at that time.

Having listened to the representations made by a good many of the political leaders of Japan, and finding that even in the majority party there was a serious split among them, we should not hesitate any longer to have a drastic revision of the so-called base rights in Okinawa. That does not mean we cannot negotiate an arrangement with them whereby we will have some privileges in regard to that base, but will not be in control.

Likewise, I think the time has come for some drastic renegotiation of our naval base arrangement in Japan itself. I am satisfied that if we do not take the leadership in regard to this matter, it is only a matter of time before the people of Japan will exercise such power that no administration in Japan will be able to continue the arrangement that exists between the United States and Japan, because the people will defeat any administration which seeks to continue those arrangements.

I cite the Japanese situation because I wish to point out there is a lag long after it is safe to relinquish base rights. There is inevitably a lag in relinquishing or modifying those rights.

So when we have a bill in the Senate which calls for the development and the expenditure of millions and billions of dollars, which I discussed Friday, for the development of American bases in southeast Asia, I say to the American people, you authorize and appropriate funds for these American bases in southeast Asia, and we will seek to stay there for many years to come.

All that is going to do is inflame large areas of Asia and to develop more and more anti-American feeling among the masses of the people of Asia, and finally we will be thrown out.

Let me say, frankly, that if most of us were Asians, we would feel the same way, for we cannot expect Asians to have the United States exercise any dictatorial power or exert any dominating control in any segment of Asia in the years ahead.

Before I close, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD following my speech the entire special report to the Cochairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indochina of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam, dated June 2, 1962.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. On page 10 of this report, the International Control Commission said:

The South Vietnamese mission in its letter dated March 15, 1962, has not furnished the necessary information required by the Commission, other than stating that this military assistance command is not a military command in the usual sense of the term, and that its only function is to supervise and manage the utilization of American personnel and equipment. The mission stated further that there was no military alliance between the United States of America and the Republic of Vietnam as no treaty of this nature had been ratified by either Government.

That is interesting. Let the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, answer that, because part of the case of Mr. Rusk—and it is a very lame case—is that there is a legal alliance existing between our country and South Vietnam. But as of June 2, 1962, the International Control Commission's report stated that the South Vietnamese Government itself, in a report to the Control Commission, stated that no treaty of this nature has been ratified by either government.

The Commission goes on to say:

Taking all the facts into consideration, and basing itself on its own observations and authorized statements made in the United States of America and the Republic of Vietnam, the Commission concludes that the Republic of Vietnam has violated articles 16 and 17 of the Geneva agreement in receiving the increased military aid from the United States of America in the absence of any established credit in its favor. The Commission is also of the view that, though there may not be any formal military alliance between the Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Vietnam, the establishment of a U.S. military assistance command in South Vietnam, as well as the introduction of a large number of U.S. military personnel beyond the stated strength of the MAAG (military assistance advisory group), amounts to a factual military alliance, which is prohibited under article 19 of the Geneva agreement.

Not one word about the finding of the International Control Commission by our Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, when he released, months ago, that propaganda document called the white paper on Vietnam. Not one word was there by the Secretary of State in his testimony at the public hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee the other day about the findings by the International Control Commission of the South Vietnam and the United States violations of the Geneva accords; but he dealt at some length with the violations of the Geneva accords by North Vietnam and the Vietcong.

As the senior Senator from Oregon has pointed out time and time again on the floor of the Senate during the last two and a half years, there is no doubt of the violations of the Geneva accords

by North Vietnam, the Vietcong, and, under the table, by Red China, in my opinion; but also there is no doubt of the violations of the Geneva accords by the United States and by South Vietnam.

If, as, and when this matter gets before the Security Council, in my opinion there is no question of the devastating case that will be made against the U.S. outlawry in southeast Asia. Those are the inescapable, ugly realities we are going to confront our people with as the pages of history are written concerning our depredations in southeast Asia.

More of that later, as the debate continues, because the debate will continue even after the Senate takes whatever course of action it decides to take on the pending issue.

If we authorize the President to continue escalating the war, or if the President escalates it on his own, as he shockingly told the Nation in recent hours he can do without any resolution, what an assumption of power on the part of a mere man without seeking authorization by the exercise of constitutional processes.

Mr. President, this power of the President must be checked. The President must be held to an accounting by the people of this country. He has drawn the issue, not the senior Senator from Oregon, and not those of us who are opposed to the President's policies. It is the President who has drawn the issue, now aided and abetted by his Vice President.

Those two leaders of this Government must be checked by the American people wherever they can exercise a check, and the American people must start exercising that check in the primaries in 1966, and in the election of November 1966.

That is why I repeat what I have already stated in my State. As far as my party is concerned, I shall support no Democratic candidate for any congressional position in either the primary or the general election in my State who supports the policy that we are following in southeast Asia in making war, in my judgment, outside of the framework of the Constitution and in contravention of our obligations under international law.

I repeat what I said in the hearings the other day. In my judgment the American people are going to repudiate this policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Gerry Pratt, business editor of the Oregonian, published in the Oregonian on Monday, February 21, 1966, entitled "War-Fueled Inflation Runs Wild in Saigon," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 21, 1966]

MAKING THE DOLLAR: WAR-FUELED INFLATION RUNS WILD IN SAIGON

(By Gerry Pratt)

SAIGON.—Part of the "urgency" that brought the top administration team here from Washington last week in the wake of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's mission is the runaway inflation that is burning up Saigon.

Money in circulation in this country is reported to have increased twelvefold over the past 6 months so that already you are taking your Vietnamese piasters in packages of 1,000 or 5,000. Paying the tab at one of the plush Saigon night spots takes on the aspect of a job for the Brink's delivery van.

One of the answers the economists are considering is to flush this place full of consumer goods; "to sop up the loose money," one explained to me. The extra consumer items, he reasoned, also would give the farmers an incentive to start putting in two and three crops a year instead of merely growing what rice he needs locally.

The United States has shipped 275,000 tons of Public Law 480 gift rice into this country in the past 6 months.

But Vietnam is already a land of plenty. The black market is everywhere, changing American "green" at upward of 160 piasters to the dollar, more than double the 73-to-the-dollar exchange rate by the government. Ironically, under some kind of special deal aimed at curbing speculation by our people here, the American Embassy offers a modified black market exchange rate of 116 piasters.

SOCIETY LAUGHS AT POOLSIDE

At the plush Saigon Sports and Tennis Club where Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge comes for a dip at noon and tennis, when things are not too hot, you see this money-making society of wealthy Chinese, Americans, Vietnamese, and East Indians, svelt-looking men with well-tanned hides, laughing with drinks at poolside and sharing the comfort of the place with girls in bikini suits.

A local Chinese who had come to lunch to compare notes with the influential Americans made it a point this day of showing off the milk importer, the automobile man, the holders of special licenses who are coining money at a fabulous rate. He was a cement dealer, he said, and openly admitted his two warehouses full of imported cement were available for 325 piasters a bag, almost triple the announced government control rate.

Listening to him and the Americans who respond to your naive interest in this, they tell you of a recent shipment from state-side for the military PX here. Seven trucks were sent to pick up the goods, only five returned. Two were missing, fully loaded. When the PX brass went after the truck contractor, his shoulders: "What two trucks?" he said. "I have only five trucks. Those other two did not belong to me."

They couldn't touch him and another bundle of PX stamped cigarettes and what-have-you went into circulation "sopping up the loose money."

At the dockside where the ships stand for a month or more waiting for space to unload, a French insurance broker introduced by an American friend explained why the docks cannot handle the shipments.

"When your American buildup became obvious, the Chinese warehouse owners made lease contracts with the American AID people," he said, "Now the Chinese leave their goods on the docks and pay nothing. Before they will ever unclog this harbor they will have to shut it down for 10 days and tell the Chinese to move their goods or dump them in the river. Then dump them. It is the only thing they understand."

KOREAN WAR "ALL OVER AGAIN"

The old pros of Asian wartime economics here tell you this is Korea all over again with the profiteering that suckles off Uncle Sam's economic offensives.

When the *Kimon*, a Liberian ship, put in here a month ago with a cargo of Public Law 480 rice, her manifest showed there were 878 bags lost between the ship and the warehouse; 669 bags found empty in the cargo and 5,748 wet bags or reportedly unsalable rice. At \$125 a ton 10 tons to the

bags, that is a \$50,000 shrinkage in Uncle Sam's shipment.

The Greek vessel *Elias Dayfas* is another that put in recently. Her story was she ran out of fuel off Yokohama and had to be pulled to Japan to take on more fuel. When she arrived at Saigon there were 7,000 bags of rotten rice in her cargo, 700,000 pounds of Public Law 480 rice that was infested and stinking.

Nobody points a finger at anyone else; but it happens and you shake your head listening to these stories and reading the manifests of ships, * * * until your American host, who has shown you some of this to help take the stars out of your eyes, smiles and says: "Water flows where water is * * * that is a Vietnamese expression that means just what it says."

"No," he reasons. "This war has come to be a way of life for too many people. There are a lot of people here in Saigon that would hate like hell to see it settled."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Pratt has been in Vietnam for some period of time, and during the last several weeks has been writing a series of articles in the Oregonian dealing with his observations in Vietnam.

Mr. President, again we get another person on the scene who does not find that the factual situation in many particulars corresponds to the representations of the White House, the State Department, and the Defense Establishment in regard to what is really going on in South Vietnam.

This is a second article by Mr. Pratt, the business editor of the Oregonian, dated February 24, 1966, under the heading, "Our Man in Saigon—South Viets, United States Often Bungle Economic Aid." This is an article which sets forth what the senior Senator from Oregon has referred to many times in recent years as I have protested the inefficiency, maladministration, and mismanagement of our foreign aid program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "South Viets, United States Often Bungle Economic Aid," written by Gerry Pratt, business editor, the Oregonian, dated February 24, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOUTH VIETS, UNITED STATES OFTEN BUNGLE ECONOMIC AID

(By Gerry Pratt)

SAIGON.—The days dull your eyes to the basic weaknesses of our position in this country. In the beginning, when you see Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky, flourishing mustache and dressed in a scarlet dinner jacket at a steak-and-wine dinner hosted by Vietnam, the weakness is very sharp.

To the north, Ho Chi Minh walks in sandals cut from worn tires, dressed in a \$2 army suit. And maybe what he does is terrible and wrong, but it is easier to identify him with the people we are seeking to win than it is to identify the Young Turks in South Vietnam in their black-silk flying suits shooting up the countryside in \$2 million American airplanes.

But you accept the steak dinner and the wine and then you accept another, the dinner at the Chinese restaurant in the Cho Lon district of Saigon, where the restaurant entrance must be secured from bombs by a wire mesh enclosure.

The dinner in Cho Lon is by the ministers of the forestry department and they serve sharkfin soup and a whole suckling pig, a

half dozen courses in all, with drinks and wine and small talk. And it is days now since you first came to Vietnam so that when you leave you hardly stop to look at the two babies asleep on the sidewalk, clutching to a piece of cardboard, bare and filthy as no human was meant to be.

"What can we do for them? Is there no program, no welfare?"

And your Vietnamese host grows nervous: "I, too, am helpless in the face of a child," he says. "But there are so many of them." And he shrugs and calls for the car and driver to take us away from Cho Lon and the children in the streets.

MANY STARTS, NO COMPLETIONS

All this we are trying to solve and to win a war and everyone has a different idea on where to start so that we have dozens of beginnings and no completions.

In the Provinces I talked with an \$80-a-month AID volunteer from Minnesota, living in great jeopardy in a tiny hamlet shanty among the natives he is trying to help, half naked natives whose women walk bare breasted and whose men wear army boots and no trousers.

Our volunteer in this village was grateful to talk to Americans; grateful that someone had the interest to come and see a project that he had lived with for 2 years. But he was distracted, too, and finally, over cold tea, he explained:

"I have too many projects. I think the last count was there were 17 projects that I am supposed to supervise. Yesterday they sent me a new one from Saigon—find 18 students for a scholarship program to the United States. Great.

"Look around and find me 18 in this area who can speak English. But on the forms for the scholarships it says, 'list degrees and grades.'

"So I send it back to Saigon and ask them to be more specific. Do they want 18 of these people for college scholarships?"

"It is like that all the time. Washington sends out a new team with the command: 'Now this time we must do something dramatic; we must show these people we mean business.' So we get a request for 18 students for American scholarships. I could send them 18 students; that would be dramatic."

BUREAUCRACY SPAWNS CONFUSION

And so it goes from the great bureaucracy we have created in Saigon, comes a mass of confusion and expensive projects. The cold storage locker built on the coast to the north of here by AID funds so the fishermen could store their catch, was one.

"But the Vietnamese fishermen have no trouble selling and eating their catch at once; also there was no electric power for the cold-storage plant. So today that expensive plant is serving as 'quarters' for a half dozen villagers who really don't know why the crazy Americans built them such a place to live."

Outside Saigon on the road skirting the infamous D zone of Vietcong that is hit again and again by the big bombers from Guam, there is a spectacular powerplant, a huge, crisp and clean building designed to generate power for the lights of Saigon, where the air conditioners go off until 10 p.m., and where the lights at the early church mass suddenly dim for want of local power.

The big powerplant has never been used. "One Vietcong with a scope-rifle can put us out of business," explained a military adviser in the province. "We cannot keep the power lines open."

Yet we keep pumping in the rural electrification plans; the tried and true New Deal devices for getting an economy off its feet; and we keep falling flat on our can.

We have an excellent hog program here, whereby we give them Public Law 48 corn and new breed hogs to increase the pork

yield. And until the people became hungry and ate the corn and then the breeders, it worked fine.

But all of this vanishes in a haze of confusing enthusiasm and wishfulness in Vietnam. And as the days pass and the urgency of the situation fades, it is difficult to remember the terrible consequences of failure.

Mr. MORSE. Maladministration has existed in South Vietnam from the beginning. The Comptroller General of the United States has made reports that point out the maladministration of the foreign aid over there. Mr. Pratt has observed some of the same maladministration and writes a column on it. This is a business editor, who writes in the field of business problems. I need not tell Senators that he writes in a newspaper that is not considered a pro-Morse newspaper in my State.

There are not any pro-Morse newspapers except one little one down in Coos Bay, Ore. All of the rest are against me.

Having mentioned that, I am never going to lose my sense of humor on this job; otherwise, it would kill me. CBS decided that they would have a documentary on the Senator from Oregon. For 10 days or 2 weeks they sent out their television team and called on my neighbors around my farm in Oregon, obviously hoping they could report that I did not have the support among my neighbors. But they discovered my neighbors agree with me.

Although they took these films, I have asked CBS, for my own film library and my descendants years to come, to at least supply me with film they took and did not use. I would have paid them for it. It is interesting history to record.

But they went down to the Young State Democratic convention to find if they could discover an anti-Morse attitude there. They were not satisfied there.

Not to be stopped they went to the editors of the State. I did not see the film. It is said that it was shown the other night. Of course, they were able to get editors who would not sing my praises.

The Oregonian has since published an editorial that, of course, I will be defeated in 1968. They have published those editorials ever since they have been seeking to defeat me. I hope that they continue publishing those editorials. They will be very helpful to my cause when I seek reelection, as I shall.

The editors accommodated CBS, although many people who saw this documentary the other night said, "You know, you came out pretty well. These editors said, in effect, that it was not going to be easy to beat you."

I make this comment because I am satisfied that when the people get the facts, if we can get the facts to them, that this administration will soon understand it is either going to change its foreign policy, or the people are going to change this administration. That is what I think will happen, and should.

Mr. President, I announced before you came into the Chamber to take the chair—the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] was acting as the Presiding Officer at the time—that I would finish my

comments tonight and withhold offering my amendment until tomorrow.

EXHIBIT 1

OUR FUTURE WAR IN VIETNAM—ESCALATION WILL LEAD US INTO A HOPELESS TRAP

(By Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG)

The most pressing problem facing our Nation and the world today is the war in Vietnam. I hope our President will continue to strike out boldly for a peaceful settlement of this bitter conflict. Bona fide peace negotiations mean concessions by us, concessions by the Vietcong, and a cease-fire with no one an abject loser and no one an arrogant winner. Unless there is a negotiated settlement, American GI's are likely to be fighting and dying in Vietnam in 1980.

President Johnson is to be commended for directing a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. On November 23, I asked him to halt this bombing for 5 days at Christmas. He extended it beyond that. But standing alone, this is not enough. We must further clarify our war aims and negotiating position. There are conflicting or imprecise statements by our officials on our support for the Geneva accords, on negotiations with the Vietcong, and on free elections. We should clearly announce our willingness to seek a settlement based on the 1954 Geneva accords providing neutrality, self-determination, and free elections for Vietnam. The Geneva accords, which we agreed to but did not sign, state, "The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary."

We should indicate explicitly our readiness to participate in negotiations with all parties involved—I mean with delegates of the Vietcong, or National Liberation Front, so-called. We should agree to abide by the results of a peaceful, free election by the people of Vietnam of their own government, their own leaders, and their own destiny. I know our CIA officials in Vietnam and Prime Minister Ky of the Saigon government oppose an armistice at this time. Our President should overrule their views along with those of the Curtis LeMays.

If our President moves decisively for such a peace, our people will support him. If instead, he approves steadily expanding military involvement, he will please our militarists, and war hawks in Congress. Then in the 1966 congressional elections and in 1968, as casualty lists mount, some Republican politicians, now urging acceleration of the war by bombing Hanoi and Haiphong and even Red China, will be the first to denounce this as "Lyndon's war."

Were we to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong, thousands of Vietnamese civilians, including women and children, would be killed and wounded. If we failed to destroy all the war planes of North Vietnam, undoubtedly some would bomb Saigon, and elements of the North Vietnamese Army, numbering some 400,000, would cross the demilitarized zone and invade South Vietnam.

Pentagon gossip reports plans to bomb Haiphong and Hanoi, followed by an amphibious landing at Haiphong and after that the bombing of Red China back into the Stone Age. Let's hope President Johnson rejects these proposals. Bombing Hanoi would be compared with the Nazi bombing of Guernica in the Spanish civil war. Furthermore, no one can accurately forecast just how damaging the reaction would be. It would at least outweigh any possible military gain.

From September 28 to October 20, I was in southeast Asia most of the time. I went, looked, and listened. In South Vietnam, I was at every airbase except one—traveling through the entire area by helicopter, airplane, and jeep. It is my considered judgment that South Vietnam is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States. Furthermore, the fact is that

the conflict raging in Vietnam is a civil war. General Westmoreland stated to me that the bulk of the Vietcong troops fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. General Stilwell went further. He stated that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting in the Mekong Delta area south of Saigon were born and reared in that area.

No matter how often we profess our intention to defend freedom in Vietnam, the increasing escalation of the war is raising grave doubts throughout Asia and elsewhere in the world as to the wisdom of our policy. Attacks with sophisticated weapons on unsophisticated and illiterate Asians is building a vast reservoir of anti-Americanism and misunderstanding of our country among the masses of the people in Asia.

HERITAGE OF HATE FOR THE FUTURE

A military surrender to the United States will never produce acceptance of American presence in Asia by most Asians. It would be a legacy of ill will that we should not leave to future generations of Americans. Until Asiatics show more interest in defending themselves, then unilateral American involvement in Asia is doomed to failure. The ugly reality is that for the most part it is American GI's who are fighting and dying in Vietnam for the alleged defense of freedom in Asia. Do we Americans have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world?

President John F. Kennedy said on September 3, 1963, shortly before his assassination, "I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government has gotten out of touch with the people."

Our initial commitment to South Vietnam made by President Eisenhower in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam stated, "I am instructing the American Ambassador * * * to examine with you * * * how an intelligent program of American aid * * * can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial * * *." He added, "The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means * * *. The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government."

Can anyone claim that Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam, who himself was born and reared in Hanoi, heads a strong, viable state? He could not remain in power a single day except for the operations of our Central Intelligence Agency and the support of our Armed Forces.

To justify sending a military advisory group to Vietnam and increasing its size from 327 in 1953 to 685 in 1961, President Eisenhower on April 7, 1954, said, "The loss of Indochina will cause the fall of southeast Asia like a set of dominoes." That was in the Stalin era. During Stalin's time, there was a bitter cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States. This is no longer true. The Soviet Union is no longer a "have not" nation. It is veering toward capitalism. Its leaders and the Russian people seek co-existence instead of coannihilation. Moscow and Peiping are now in bitter conflict. This domino theory has been completely discredited.

Red China is a paper dragon. It is overrated as a great power. It has crude nuclear capability. It will take 5 or 10 years before it will have the know-how to deliver any nuclear warheads on targets. Its air force is inferior. It has no surface navy except a few torpedo and gunboats, no modern transports—nothing except thousands of junks. It is an agrarian nation, with 85 percent of the population engaged in agriculture. On the Pacific, under the Pacific, and in the air, we have a more powerful Navy, submarine fleet and Air Force than all the nations of the world combined.

Can anyone claim that we would lose face and that our prestige in Asia would be damaged were we to withdraw from this conflict? France was bled white during the 7 years' struggle to save her vast colonial empire, Indochina. France became a greater and more powerful nation following her withdrawal from what is now North and South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Furthermore, did De Gaulle lose face or prestige when he surrendered Algeria, that vast domain larger than France?

The winds of freedom are blowing across the China Sea and elsewhere throughout the world in a manner and to an extent almost beyond belief. De Gaulle and France regained greatness by recognizing this fact. Surely we should not respond with our Armed Forces whenever the winds of change strike a country in southeast Asia or anywhere in the world. In Vietnam the security of the United States is not the issue. Vietnam very definitely is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

We should have long since learned that the outcome of a guerrilla war in the swamps, jungles, and highlands of southeast Asia does not threaten the security of the United States. We should, if we wish, give money, food, or guns, giving this aid from afar. We should withdraw from implicating ourselves so deeply into this conflict as to convert it into an American war.

WRONG WAR, WRONG TIME, WRONG PLACE

This steaming jungle where thousands of American GI's will be afflicted with malaria and other jungle diseases is the worst place in the world for us to wage a ground war. Where could we have found a worse place than this area 10,000 miles from our shores?

Americans should not blindly accept the propaganda coming from Washington. If mistakes are compounded on mistakes, then the conflict will be expanded and escalated. If, on the other hand, we follow the example of France, which gave up a great department of France, Algeria, our prestige will be enhanced in the eyes of the entire world, just as that of France has been enhanced since 1956.

I do not want to be misunderstood as advocating our unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam.

In my judgment, our national interest requires a redirection of policy in Asia. We should not be the sole defenders of freedom as we define freedom in Asia. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and our CIA should take a back seat when it comes to formulating foreign policy. I hope President Johnson will reassert that civilian authority must remain supreme over that of the military. The United States must reorient its policy. Any forces we have there should be only part of the forces of many nations under the United Nations and for peacekeeping and not war-making purposes. They should be there in response to a widespread and deep-felt Asian need for assistance.

Vietnam is a land of breathtaking seacoasts, green jungles, fertile rice paddies, picturesque mountains—a lovely Garden of Eden converted into a hell on earth by man's inhumanity to man. Let it not be written by future historians that American boys died needlessly in far-distant jungles because of

weakness of diplomats and indifference of politicians. I wish I had as much confidence in the skill and intelligence of our diplomats in trying to settle this war as I do in the bravery and high competence of our soldiers fighting the war.

The primary reason for our being in Vietnam today is our proud refusal to admit a mistake in our attempt to make Vietnam a pro-American and an anti-Chinese state. More than anything else, we are fighting to avoid admitting failure. As Walter Lippmann bluntly put it, "We are fighting to save face."

The late President John F. Kennedy said, "Transforming Vietnam into a Western redboubt is ridiculous."

Sallust, the Roman historian, about 40 years before the birth of our Saviour, wrote "It is always easy to begin a war, but very difficult to stop one, since its beginning and end are not under the control of the same man." That is true now as it was then. President Johnson deserves praise for ordering a holdup in bombing North Vietnam while his executive department officials are seeking to secure an armistice and cease-fire at the conference table with representatives of the Vietcong of National Liberation Front, so-called, and Hanoi.

We Americans should not be so much interested in saving face as in saving lives—the lives of Americans and Asiatics.

EXHIBIT 2

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SUPERVISION AND CONTROL IN VIETNAM—SPECIAL REPORT TO THE COCHAIRMAN

The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam presents its compliments to the Cochairman of the Geneva Conference on Indochina and has the honor to refer to paragraph 2 of their message of May 8, 1956, in which the Cochairmen asked the Commission to inform them in case the Commission encountered any difficulties in its activities which could not be resolved on the spot and simultaneously had urged both the parties in Vietnam to extend to the Commission all possible cooperation and assistance. The International Commission had assured the Cochairmen in its message of May 27, 1956, that it would continue to persevere in its efforts to maintain and strengthen peace in Vietnam and affirmed its determination to perform its duties within the framework of the Geneva agreement.¹

2. The International Commission has, from time to time, submitted to the Cochairmen interim reports giving a résumé of its activities as well as a brief review of the progress made by the two parties in the implementation of the provisions of the agreement. In these reports, apart from other things, the Commission had pointed out its difficulties, particularly with regard to the tendency of the parties to refuse to accept and implement the Commission's recommendations and decisions and their persistence in maintaining their own stand in certain cases. The Cochairmen were also informed about the difficulties which the Commission's fixed teams were experiencing with regard to the performance of their mandatory tasks of control and inspection in terms of their responsibilities under articles 35 and 36(d) of the agreement.

3. In its 11th interim report, which covered the period from February 1, 1960, to February 28, 1961, the Commission had mentioned that, in spite of certain difficulties and the lurking dangers in Vietnam, the active presence of the Commission and its work had helped in preserving peace.

4. Since the presentation of the 11th interim report, the situation in Vietnam has shown signs of rapid deterioration. The

Commission is obliged to make this special report to the Cochairmen with regard to the serious allegations of aggression and subversion on the part of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam against the Republic of Vietnam and the serious charges of violation of Articles 16, 17, and 19 of the Geneva agreement by the Republic of Vietnam, in receiving military aid from the United States of America.

The Polish delegation dissents from the views expressed in this special report. The statement of the Polish delegation is forwarded herewith.

5. Reference is invited to paragraph 24 of the 10th interim report and paragraph 32 of the 11th interim report, in which mention was made of the concern which the Republic of Vietnam has been expressing over the problem of subversion in South Vietnam. Mention was also made in paragraph 61 of the 11th interim report to the complaints, which the Commission had received from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, accusing the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam of aggression in the Kontum and Pleiku Provinces during October 1960. Complaints of this nature continued to increase during 1961. In June 1961 the Commission made known its stand regarding its competence to entertain and examine complaints of this nature in terms of specific articles of the Geneva agreement.

6. The Commission also received several complaints from the High Command of the People's Army of Vietnam (PAVN) making serious allegations with regard to the increased introduction of U.S. military personnel into South Vietnam, along with substantial quantities of war material, in contravention of articles 16 and 17. All these allegations were forwarded to the South Vietnamese mission for comments. The party in most cases denied these allegations. But the Commission was not in a position to make a precise assessment as to the correctness or otherwise of these allegations, as the Commission's teams at most points of entry have not been able to carry out effective inspections and controls. However, the South Vietnamese mission did state in July 1961, that whatever American aid its Government was receiving was meant to fight Communist subversion in South Vietnam, and in support of this contention it had also referred to the text of the communique published after the visit of the U.S. Vice President Johnson to Saigon, in May 1961.

7. While the Commission continued to function in this difficult atmosphere, a communication was received on September 9, 1961, from the Liaison Mission of the Republic of Vietnam, alleging that the PAVN forces had launched another action in the Kontum region on September 1, 1961. The letter containing these allegations was forwarded to the Liaison Mission of the PAVN High Command for its comments. In its reply under its letter No. 492/CT/I/B dated December 11, 1961, the mission stated that "the PAVN high command will resolutely reject all decisions taken by the International Commission relating to the so-called subversive activities in South Vietnam, a question which has no relevance to the Geneva agreement." It further informed the Commission that "henceforth the mission would find itself constrained to resolutely reject all possible requests for comments of this kind."

8. In the meanwhile, in early October 1961, the Secretariat of State for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Vietnam alleged that Col. Hoang Thuy Nam, the chief of the Vietnamese mission in charge of relations with the International Commission, had been kidnaped. Later, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs informed the Commission of the murder of Colonel Nam. The complicity of the authorities in the North in the kidnaping and murder of Colonel Nam was alleged. Reference is invited to the Com-

mission's message No. IC/ADM/V-5/61/4097 dated November 9, 1961, in this regard. Since the allegations were of a serious nature, the Commission requested the South Vietnamese mission to furnish prima facie evidence to support their charge of the complicity of the northern party in this incident. The Commission received detailed communications from the mission on documents and photographs, in support of their contention. The mission also stated that the "Government of the Republic of Vietnam is confident that the case of Col. Hoang Thuy Nam should be taken, not as an isolated case, but as part of the extensive plan of subversion and terrorism deliberately decided by the Hanoi authorities, a plan which, with this assassination enters a new phase of execution and is designed for seizing power in South Vietnam." In November 1961, the Commission considered these letters containing numerous allegations, and referred them to its Legal Committee for examination "with a view to determining whether the allegations and evidence therein prima facie attract any provisions of the Geneva agreement."

9. The Legal Committee has made a careful examination of the various allegations and the evidence produced to support them, in the form of documents and other material evidence, and has made the following report, with the Polish member dissenting:

"We have studied the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, the South Vietnamese mission's letter No. 4460/PDVN/CT/TD/2 dated October 24, 1961, and No. 5078/PDVN/CT/TD/2 dated November 16, 1961, and related references from the commission together with the evidentiary material made available by the South Vietnamese mission in connection therewith, and reached the following conclusions:

(1) The agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam proceeds on the principle of the complete cessation of all hostilities in Vietnam, respect by either party of the zone assigned to the other, and the inescapable responsibility of the parties for the fulfillment of the obligations resulting therefrom.

Article 10 of the agreement states expressly the obligation of the two parties to order and enforce the complete cessation of all hostilities in Vietnam.

Article 19 of the agreement casts the obligation on the two parties to insure that the zones assigned to them are not used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy.

Article 24 of the agreement proceeds on the principle of the inviolability of the demilitarized zone and the territories assigned to the two parties and states expressly that the armed forces of each party shall respect the territory under the military control of the other party and shall commit no act and undertake no operation against the other party.

Article 27 of the agreement affirms expressly the responsibility of the commanders of the forces of the two parties of insuring full compliance with all the provisions of the agreement by all elements and military personnel under their command.

It follows that the using of one zone for the organization or the carrying out of any hostile activities in the other zone, violations by members of the armed forces of one party of the territory of the other party, or the Commission by any element under the control of one party of any act directed against the other party, would be contrary to the fundamental provisions of the agreement which enjoin mutual respect for the territories assigned to the two parties.

(2) Having examined the complaints and the supporting material sent by the South Vietnamese mission, the committee has come to the conclusion that in specific instances there is evidence to show that armed and unarmed personnel, arms, munitions and

¹ "Miscellaneous No. 20 (1954)," Cmd. 9239.

other supplies have been sent from the zone in the north to the zone in the south with the object of supporting, organizing and carrying out hostile activities, including armed attacks, directed against the armed forces and administration of the zone in the south. These acts are in violation of articles 10, 19, 24 and 27 of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam.

(3) In examining the complaints and the supporting material, in particular documentary material sent by the South Vietnamese mission, the Committee has come to the further conclusion that there is evidence to show that the PAVN has allowed the zone in the north to be used for inciting, encouraging, and supporting hostile activities in the zone in the south, aimed at the overthrow of the administration in the south. The use of the zone in the north for such activities is in violation of articles 19, 24, and 27 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam.

(4) The Committee considers that further investigation is necessary to reach a final conclusion as to whether the kidnaping and murder of Colonel Nam, late chief of the South Vietnamese mission, was a part of the activities referred to in subparagraphs (2) and (3) above and prohibited under articles 19, 24, and 27 of the agreement. The South Vietnamese mission has furnished prima facie evidence to warrant such a full investigation of the case by the Commission.

2. We shall submit in due course a full report setting out in detail the complaints made by the South Vietnamese mission, the evidence forwarded in relation to these complaints, and our specific observations thereon.

10. The Commission accepts the conclusions reached by the Legal Committee that there is sufficient evidence to show beyond reasonable doubt that the PAVN has violated articles 10, 19, 24, and 27 in specific instances. The Polish delegation dissents from these conclusions. On the basis of the fuller report, that is being prepared by the Legal Committee covering all the allegations and incidents, the Commission will take action as appropriate in each individual case.

11. Concurrently with the developments referred to in paragraphs 7 and 8 above, and subsequently, the Commission received communications from the PAVN high command and its liaison mission alleging direct military intervention in South Vietnam by the Government of the United States of America, and ever-increasing import of war material and introduction of military personnel in violation of the Geneva Agreement. The allegations, among others, were:

(a) The conclusions of a bilateral military agreement between President Ngo Dinh Diem and U.S. Ambassador Nolting;

(b) The gradual introduction of about 5,000 U.S. military personnel into South Vietnam, "which will soon be increased to 8,000";

(c) The arrival of four aircraft carriers—*Core*, *Bretton*, *Princeton*, and *Croatan*—on different occasions, bringing in helicopters, other aircraft, military equipment, and military personnel;

(d) The introduction by the United States of America of approximately four companies of helicopters, many jet fighters, fighters, fighter bombers, and transport planes, along with military vehicles and other stores;

(e) The visits of a large number of high U.S. military experts and dignitaries to Saigon for inspection and guidance, particularly those of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Adm. H. Felt and General Lemnitzer;

(f) The establishment of a U.S. Military Assistance Command, with a four-star General, Paul D. Harkins, as its chief.

12. Since December 1961 the Commission's teams in South Vietnam have been persistently denied the right to control and inspect, which are part of their mandatory tasks. Thus, these teams, though they were able to

observe the steady and continuous arrival of war material, including aircraft carriers with helicopters on board, were unable, in view of the denial of controls, to determine precisely the quantum and nature of war material unloaded and introduced into South Vietnam.

13. On the other hand, the Commission received a communication from Liaison Mission of the Republic of Vietnam dated December 9, 1961, stating that: "In the face of the aggression, directed by the so-called 'Democratic Republic of Vietnam' against the Republic of Vietnam, in flagrant violation of the Geneva agreement, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam has requested the Government of the United States of America to intensify the aid in personnel and material which the latter was already granting to Vietnam. The right of 'self-defense' being a legitimate and inherent attribute of sovereignty, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam found itself constrained to exercise this right and request for increased aid, since North Vietnam continues to violate the Geneva agreement and to do injury to life and property of the free people of Vietnam.

"These measures can end as soon as the North Vietnam authorities will have ceased the acts of aggression and will have begun to respect the Geneva agreement."

14. The Commission considered this communication from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and drew the attention of the South Vietnamese mission to the provisions of articles 16 and 17 of the Geneva agreement and the procedures laid down thereunder by the International Commission for the import of war material and the introduction of military personnel, and to the obligations resulting therefrom. The Commission also informed the mission that its complaints regarding allegations of subversion and aggression by the north were under active examination of the Commission separately.

15. In the light of the stand of the Commission as stated in paragraph 14 above, the numerous allegations received from the PAVN high command have been receiving the attention of the Commission with a view to the strict implementation of articles 16 and 17 of the agreement and the procedures laid down thereunder.

16. A summary of the allegations made by the PAVN high command, from December 1961, and up to May 5, 1962, would place the number of military personnel and the quantum of important war materials introduced into South Vietnam at approximately 5,000 personnel (which are likely to increase to 8,000 shortly), 157 helicopters, 10 reconnaissance aircraft, 34 jet aircraft, 34 fighters/fighter bombers, 21 transport aircraft, 35 unspecified aircraft, 40 armored and 20 scout cars, numerous armored boats and amphibious craft, 3,000 tons and 1,350 cases of war material, and 7 warships (exclusively of destroyers of the U.S. 7th Fleet alleged to have come for training). Most of the letters containing the allegations, referred to in this paragraph and paragraph 11 above, were sent to the liaison mission of the Republic of Vietnam for its early comments; but no satisfactory replies have been received. Also, in some cases the southern party has been asked to state reasons, if any, why violations of article 17(e) relating to prior notifications, as well as violations of articles 16 and 17 governing the introduction of military personnel and war material themselves, should not be recorded against it.

17. As the Commission has been denied mandatory controls, as pointed out earlier in paragraph 12 above, it has not been able to make a precise assessment of the number of military personnel and the quantum of war material brought in. However, from December 3, 1961, up to May 5, 1962, the Commission's teams have controlled the en-

try of 72 military personnel, and observed but not controlled 173 military personnel, 62 helicopters, 6 reconnaissance aircraft, 5 jet aircraft, 57 fighters/fighter bombers, 25 transport aircraft, 26 unspecified types of aircraft, 102 jeeps, 8 tractors, 8 105-millimeter howitzers, 3 armored carriers (tracked), 29 armored fighting vehicle trailers, 404 other trailers, and radar equipment and crates, 5 warships, 9 LST's (including 4 visiting LST's), 3 LCT's, 5 visiting aircraft carriers and spares of various kinds. In respect of some of the instances of import of war materials between December 3, 1961, and January 16, 1962, violations under article 17(e) as well as violation of article 25, have been recorded against the Republic of Vietnam for its failure to notify arrivals and imports as required by the Geneva Agreement, and for not affording all possible assistance to the Commission's teams in the performance of their tasks.

18. In regard to claims for credits made by the southern party in justification of certain imports, the Commission wishes to point out that insofar as major items of war material are concerned, except in a limited number of cases, there is no established credit in favor of the Republic of Vietnam. On the other hand, for some of these items, there is already a debit against it. In this context, it must be borne in mind that, even where credit exists, according to article 17(b) of the agreement, the party can only import war material "piece for piece of the same type and with similar characteristics." However, controls not having been permitted, the Commission is not in a position to satisfy itself whether this essential requirement has in fact been fulfilled even in cases where credit exists.

19. As regards the allegation of the PAVN High Command that a U.S. Military Assistance Command has been set up in South Vietnam in violation of article 19, the Commission requested the party to furnish the following information:

- (i) Whether such a U.S. command has been set up;
- (ii) The basis on which it has been established;
- (iii) The purpose for which it has been constituted;
- (iv) Its strength;
- (v) The scope of its activities.

The South Vietnamese Mission in its letter dated March 15, 1962, has not furnished the necessary information required by the Commission, other than stating that this military assistance command is not a military command in the usual sense of the term, and that its only function is to supervise and manage the utilization of American personnel and equipment. The mission stated further that there was no military alliance between the United States of America and the Republic of Vietnam as no treaty of this nature had been ratified by either Government.

20. Taking all the facts into consideration, and basing itself on its own observations and authorized statements made in the United States of America and the Republic of Vietnam, the Commission concludes that the Republic of Vietnam has violated articles 16 and 17 of the Geneva agreement in receiving the increased military aid from the United States of America in the absence of any established credit in its favor. The Commission is also of the view that, though there may not be any formal military alliance between the Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Vietnam, the establishment of a U.S. Military Assistance Command in South Vietnam, as well as the introduction of a large number of U.S. military personnel beyond the stated strength of the MAAG (Military Assistance Advisory Group), amounts to a factual military alliance, which is prohibited under article 19 of the Geneva agreement.

21. The Commission would also like to bring to the notice of the Cochairman a recent and deliberate tendency on the part of both the parties to deny or refuse controls to the Commission's teams, thereby completely immobilizing their activities and hindering the Commission in the proper discharge of its obligations to supervise the implementation of articles 16 and 17 of the Geneva agreement. During the last few months, there has been a near-complete breakdown so far as this important function of the Commission is concerned. The Commission considered the situation and addressed detailed communications to the two parties recommending the resumption of normal controls immediately. (Copies of the letters sent to the two parties are attached as annexure I to this report.) The Commission, however, regrets to inform the Co-chairmen that there has been no improvement in this regard.

22. The International Commission wishes to draw the serious and earnest attention of the cochairmen to the gravity of the situation that has developed in Vietnam in the last few months. Fundamental provisions of the Geneva agreement have been violated by both parties, resulting in ever-increasing tension and threat of resumption of open hostilities. In this situation, the role of the Commission for the maintenance of peace in Vietnam is being greatly hampered because of denial of cooperation by both the parties. The Commission, therefore, earnestly recommends to the cochairmen that, with a view to reducing tension and preserving peace in Vietnam, remedial action be taken, in the light of this report, so as to insure that the parties—

(a) Respect the zone assigned to the other party;

(b) Observe strictly the provisions of articles 16, 17, and 19 of the Geneva agreement in respect of the import of war material and the introduction of military personnel;

(c) Commit no act and undertake no operation of a hostile nature against the other party;

(d) Do not allow the zones assigned to them to adhere to any military alliance and to be used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy;

(e) Cooperate with the International Commission in the fulfillment of its tasks of supervision and control of the implementation of the provisions of the Geneva agreement.

23. The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam takes this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest consideration to the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indochina.

G. PARTHASARATHI, *India*.
F. G. HOOTON, *Canada*.

SAIGON, June 2, 1962.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. INOUE. I have listened to the address of the Senator from Oregon with great interest.

I was especially interested in his reference to the group which I presume is composed of Senators who are critical of our present military involvement in Vietnam.

I believe the Senator indicated that the members of this group, in supporting the Tonkin Gulf resolution, stated that they did not realize that the resolution gave authority to the President to order the present military buildup in South Vietnam.

Mr. MORSE. May I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. INOUE. I merely wanted to know if I had a correct impression.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Hawaii and I both want to be exceedingly fair. I do not want to talk about those individuals as a group, because there is a difference in point of view among them. I did not say anything—at least, I did not intend to say anything—that indicated that there was any unanimity among this group. What I sought to imply was that there was another group of Senators who wished to consider what course of action they should follow, if any, in considering amendments to propose to the bill. The group was considering while I was present. What they considered after I left, I have no way of knowing. But they had before them certain rough draft amendments that they were considering at that time.

As I said earlier, they hoped I would not offer any amendment of mine until they had reached, if they could reach, a consensus as to what their position would be.

I say that because I know the way the press works. I know it will be only a matter of time before the membership of the group who were in that meeting will be known. I do not want the RECORD to indicate that WAYNE MORSE said there was a unanimity among them as to what their position was on the resolution of August 1964, or any other matter.

I repeat what I said earlier in meaning and, in language, too: that a considerable number of Senators have been making public statements to the effect that they hold to a point of view somewhat different from the one they held on August 10, 1964, or who interpret what they did on August 10, 1964, somewhat differently than what is being represented as to what they supported. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. INOUE. In other words, the Senator from Oregon did not imply that members of this group did not realize that they were authorizing the President to order a military buildup.

Mr. MORSE. I would not say that of the group; but not only do certain members of that group imply that and say that; some of them have said it publicly.

Mr. INOUE. I am surprised to hear that, because as the Senator from Oregon was speaking this afternoon, I obtained a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, August 6. I should like to quote a part of the colloquy, if I may.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, certainly.

Mr. INOUE. I should like to have the Senator's observations with respect to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. * * * We are not giving to the President any powers he has under the Constitution as Commander in Chief. We are in effect approving of his use of the powers that he has. That is the way I feel about it.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that, too. In the first section we are confirming the powers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are approving them. I do not know that we give him anything that he does not already have. Perhaps we are quibbling over words.

Mr. COOPER. We support and approve his judgment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Approve and support.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Approve and support the use he has made of his powers.

Mr. COOPER. The second section of the resolution goes, as the Senator said, to steps the President might take concerning the parties to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the countries under the protocol—which are, of course, Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam. The Senator will remember that the SEATO Treaty, in article IV, provides that in the event an armed attack is made upon a party to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, or upon one of the protocol states such as South Vietnam, the parties to the treaty, one of whom is the United States, would then take such action as might be appropriate, after resorting to their constitutional processes. I assume that would mean, in the case of the United States, that Congress would be asked to grant the authority to act.

Does the Senator consider that in enacting this resolution we are satisfying that requirement of article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty? In other words, are we now giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Vietnam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the way I would interpret it. If a situation later developed in which we thought the approval should be withdrawn, it could be withdrawn by concurrent resolution.

I have cited this because, as I recall, Thursday, August 6, 1964, was a rather historic day, a day when the Chamber was filled with Senators. I am certain that most Senators recall this section. I was surprised to note that Senators, in voting for the resolution, did not realize the possibility of the military buildup.

Mr. MORSE. In my speech on Friday, I referred to a part of that colloquy. I quoted in my speech in the Senate the colloquy between the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I pointed out then that paragraph 4 does not, in fact, carry any of that meaning. I stated that at that time the Secretary of State did not think so either. This is an afterthought on the part of the Secretary of State.

I pointed out on Friday that Secretary Dulles did not hold to that point of view, either. In fact, when the Senate ratified the SEATO Treaty, it was on the basis of representations by the Secretary of State that there would be no buildup of a land army in southeast Asia. That the Senator will find in my speech of last Friday.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] can speak for himself; he does not need me to speak for him. But the Senator from Arkansas showed his bigness, his broad gagedness, when in a national television program he was examined in regard to the position he took in August 1964. Very frankly—I do not quote him, but I believe I paraphrase him accurately—he said, in effect: I made a mistake. I did not give the matter the careful thought I now think should have been given it.

His comment to the Senator from Kentucky which the Senator from Hawaii cited was, as we lawyers say, "curbstoning." It did not represent intensive

analysis on the part of the Senator from Arkansas. In effect, he said that he has changed his mind. I respect him for the mental flexibility that gives him the ability to change his mind when he thinks that a previously held opinion was a mistaken one. But he will have to speak for himself.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for one more question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. INOUE. If the Senator's amendment should be agreed to, does the Senator believe that by the amendment the President would be denied the authority to carry on a military buildup in South Vietnam?

Mr. MORSE. I think it would be an affirmation that at long last the Senate recognized that the President does not have such authority short of a declaration of war. I should think that the adoption of such an amendment would then put it squarely up to the President to decide whether he wants to use—as I think he should use—the constitutional processes; namely, a war message, a message asking for a declaration of war.

I repeat: I do not believe this President has any right to send a single American boy into battle without a declaration of war.

Mr. INOUE. Then how would the Senator explain our military involvement in Korea and, I believe, in Lebanon, and in other areas, without a declaration of war?

Mr. MORSE. Considering the Lebanon resolution first, I took exactly the same position on that resolution. I opposed it as I opposed the Formosa resolution. As I pointed out at the time, the only reason why I supported the Cuban resolution was that power was not given to the President under the Cuban resolution. I do not have the precise situation at tongue's point, but I shall get it and place it in the RECORD tomorrow. I drew, in an international law argument at that time, the difference between the Cuban resolution and the Lebanon and Formosa resolutions.

Now I take the Senator to the Korean situation. It has been my position that it would have been much better to have had a declaration of war in the Korean situation. I shared the point of view of Senator Bob Taft, at the time, that there was a better procedure to follow. But there is this difference, and only this difference, that I think has materiality or relevancy in this debate, and that is that almost immediately in the Korean situation the President asked us to support participation in the Korean war in connection with our United Nations obligations under the charter. But my position is that it would have been much better to have had a declaration of war in that instance.

As the Senator from Hawaii has heard me say on many occasions, we cannot add up wrongs and ever get a right out of the addition.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I assume that it is possible to carry on military activities without a formal declaration of war, such as was the case in Korea.

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, it is not possible to do so and to meet the strict requirements of the Constitution. However, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Louisiana, we have conducted war over our history without declarations of war. But that has not been to our historic credit. We have sent marines into Haiti and Mexico. We have engaged in what we dubbed as involving ourselves in military intervention. I think it was to the discredit of our country.

I do not want to see us make another such mistake or to continue the mistake that we are making in southeast Asia. I would vote against a declaration of war if it were offered tomorrow on the basis of the present situation in Vietnam. However, if war were declared, as I have said many times, we must rally behind that declaration and try to get the war over as quickly as possible. At the same time, we must continue to exhaust every possible procedure that is available to us to get an honorable, negotiated settlement through existing treaty obligations. However, if we had a declaration of war, then I would simply say that we must unite behind it. Those who are conscientious objectors are protected under the existing law.

As a U.S. Senator, it would be clearly my duty under the oath I have taken four times to urge support of that war. However, where I differ with some of my colleagues in the Senate is that this is a matter for each one to decide for himself. I feel that my supporting the prosecution of this war would be in violation of my oath.

I do not think this war should be prosecuted without a declaration of war. I have stated that I do not think this administration wants to declare war. I do not think the people would support it.

I think if the President of the United States were to come up tomorrow with a war message that the people would repudiate it and make it clear to Congress that they did not want war declared. Then for the first time it would dawn on the overwhelming majority of the American people that this President is not taking us to peace, but to a serious war. He is talking about peace and taking us into war. A declaration of war would get us into serious trouble overnight with an innumerable number of allies.

There is no question that it would get us into trouble immediately with Russia. Russia would not recognize that war. She would not abide by the war message we laid down. The first Russian ship that we sank in the prosecution of that war, trying to enforce a blockade or to mine that harbor, or, for that matter, placing restrictions on Russian ships anywhere else, I think would immediately involve us in a war with Russia.

That war would not be fought in Asia. It would be fought in New York City, Washington, Detroit, Portland, Moscow, and Stalingrad.

That is why I say that we owe it to our President to check him. I am sad to say this, but, in my judgment, our President

is acting unchecked, and we need to check him, because if we do not do so, I think he will get us into a massive war.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 1, 1966, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28, 1966:

THE JUDICIARY

Collins J. Seitz, of Delaware, to be U.S. circuit judge, third circuit, vice John Biggs, Jr., retired.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS, FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Andrew F. Brimmer, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1966, vice C. Canby Balderston, term expired.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

William W. Sherrill, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years, vice Joseph W. Barr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, XXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Alva Revista Fitch, XXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 28, 1966:

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Henry Allen Moe, of New York, to be Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities for a term of 4 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The nominations beginning Eugene J. Gangarosa, to be surgeon, and ending William W. Murray, to be senior assistant therapist, which nominations were received by the Senate, and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 16, 1966.